DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 297 061 UD 026 291

AUTHOR Clement, Dorothy C.; And Others

TITLE School Desegregation and Educational Inequality: Trends in the Literature 1960-1975.

INSTITUTION North Carolina Univ., Chapel Hill.

SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.

PUB DATE 31 May 76

CONTRACT 400-76-008

NOTE 182p.

PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC08 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS Classroom Desegregation; De Facto Segregation; De Jure Segregation; *Desegregation Effects; *Desegregation Litigation; *Desegregation Methods; Educational Opportunities; Elementary Secondary Education; *Equal Education; Faculty Integration; *Literature Reviews; *School Desegregation; Urban Education; Urban Problems

ABSTRACT

The process of school desegregation has been taking place in an evolving context forged at each stage from the interaction of parties having different visions, desires, and interests. From a review of the literature on school desegregation from 1960 to 1975, it is possible to trace significant alterations in perspectives on desegregation and their resulting conceptual manifestations. The de facto-de jure distinction, for example, utilized heavily in the 1960s to calm urban fears, has undergone a shift: the domain of de jure has been greatly expanded. Battles over token desegregation have been replaced by struggles over metropolitan desegregation, and equality of educational opportunity has undergone a number of reconceptualizations. This report is divided into the following sections: (1) Introduction; (2) Frameworks: General Perspectives on School Desegregation; (3) Litigation, Legislation, and Enforcement; (4) Extent and Causes of Educational Inequality; (5) Remedial Efforts and Counter Forces in Implementation; and (6) Research on Outcomes of Desegregation. A list of over 350 references is included; following each reference is a number indicating the sub-section(s) in which the reference is discussed. (BJV)

****

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

****

Only Copy 7-7-98 10

Pls Do not Remove

ED297061

SCHOOL DESEGREGATION AND EDUCATIONAL INEQUALITY:

TRENDS IN THE LITERATURE

1960-1975

Dorothy C. Clement, Margaret Eisenhart, and John R. Wood
Department of Anthropology, University of North Carolina

Chapel Hill

May 31, 1976

Prepared for the National Institute of Education
Contract No. 400-76-0008

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

UD026291

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This review of trends in school desegregation and educational inequality literature was prepared for the National Institute of Education pursuant to Contract No. 400-76-0008.

We would like to give credit to others who assisted us in the preparation of the review. Joanne Taylor drafted Sections V.5.c. and V.5.d. Linda Catron assisted with the preparation of Section V.2.c. and provided clerical assistance. Others who helped with the massive amount of clerical work involved in the project are Mary Boyer, Mary Ann Emmons, David Howe, and Audra Kroah. We would like to especially thank Joe Harding who provided valuable editorial assistance.

CONTENTS

Page

I. INTRODUCTION.. 1
  1. Objectives.. 1
  2. Sources and Format.. 3

II. FRAMEWORKS: GENERAL PERSPECTIVES ON SCHOOL DESEGREGATION.. 6
  1. Forced Mixing/Forced Busing...................................... 8
  2. The American Creed... 10
  3. The Promise of Brown...................................... 18
  4. A Broader Context.. 20

III. LITIGATION, LEGISLATION, AND ENFORCEMENT......................... 24
  1. Litigation.. 24
    a. The Role of the Judiciary in School Desegregation.............. 24
    b. Desegregation Cases in the South - De Jure Segregation......... 27
    c. Desegregation Cases in the North and West - De Facto Segregation.... 31
    d. School Finance Cases... 34
    e. The Courts and Second-Generation Problems...................... 37
    f. Private School Cases... 38
  2. Legislation... 40
    a. The Role of Congress and the President in School Desegregation.... 40
    b. Civil Rights Legislation and School Desegregation.............. 41
    c. Federal Aid to Education....................................... 45
  3. Civil Rights Organizations and the Genesis and Implementation of School Desegregation.... 48
  4. Role of Social Science Research in the Desegregation Process..... 50

IV. EXTENT AND CAUSES OF EDUCATIONAL INEQUALITY....................... 58
  1. Color Isolation in Schools.. 58
  2. School Facilities... 61
  3. Explanations of Unequal Educational Outcomes...................... 64
    a. Cultural and Social Deprivation................................ 67
    b. Genetic Inferiority.. 70
    c. Biased Assessment and Negative Labeling........................ 71
    d. Culture Differences.. 74

Page

V. REMEDIAL EFFORTS AND COUNTER FORCES IN IMPLEMENTATION...... 76
  1. Methods of District Desegregation..................... 78
    a. Open Enrollment and Freedom of Choice............ 80
    b. Rezoning.. 81
    c. Busing.. 83
    d. Multi-district Desegregation..................... 85
  2. Community and Individual Resistance.................. 87
    a. Demonstrations, Protests, Harassment............. 87
    b. Private Schools.................................. 90
    c. White Flight..................................... 91
  3. Community Control and Decentralization................ 92
  4. The Role of School Personnel in District Desegregation 94
    a. School Boards and Administrators............... 95
    b. Teachers... 97
  5. Educational Programs and Practices Related to Desegregation.. 99
    a. Tracking and Ability Grouping.................... 103
    b. Pushouts... 104
    c. Compensatory Education........................... 105
    d. Multi-cultural Approaches........................ 109
    e. Staff Adjustment................................. 113

VI. RESEARCH ON OUTCOMES OF DESEGREGATION..................... 116
  1. Educational Outcomes................................. 119
    a. Academic Achievement............................. 120
    b. Educational Attainment........................... 124
  2. Psychological Outcomes............................... 125
    a. Orientation toward Achievement................... 126
    b. Self-Concept..................................... 129
    c. Anxiety.. 132
  3. Social Outcomes...................................... 133
    a. Cross-Color Beliefs.............................. 135
    b. Cross-Color Acceptance........................... 137
    c. Cross-Color Interaction.......................... 140
  4. A Curious Discrepancy................................ 142

VII. REFERENCES.. 146

I. Introduction

I. 1. Objectives

Desegregation of schools in the United States has been referred to as a "peacetime social revolution". At the least, school desegregation is part of a social movement, a trend in social and cultural change which has organized proponents and opponents - the former seeking to modify the status quo while the latter try to reinforce and strengthen it. School desegregation is part of a movement the aim of which, conceptualized most generally, is removal of caste-like aspects of American society.

The process of school desegregation has and is taking place in an evolving context forged at each stage from the interaction of parties having differing visions, desires, and interests. The evidence of this evolution is captured in the literature on school desegregation which fixes concepts, tactics, and approaches in their respective time frames. In the fifteen years that this review covers, it is possible to trace significant alterations in perspectives on desegregation and their resulting conceptual manifestations. The de facto-de jure distinction, for example, utilized heavily in the 1960's to calm urban fears has undergone a shift: the domain of de jure has been greatly expanded. Battles over token desegregation have been replaced by struggle over metropolitan desegregation. And, equality of educational opportunity has undergone a number of reconceptualizations.

To use the metaphor of a contest, the contest which desegregation constitutes is one in which the rules change, the goals change, and even to some extent the composition of the "sides" change over time.

In order to follow the contemporary events and anticipate future events, it is helpful to know who the participants are, what resources they use, the perceptions which those using the resources have, and the history behind the events. School desegregation is the product of many different participants: the federal and state courts, legislatures, and executives; local school and federal administrators; strong citizens groups; the public; and social scientists. The courts have made decisions which educational decision-makers normally make; the federal government has taken a much greater role in educational programs than ever before; and social science has been given a role, albeit a disputed one, in court decisions. We assume that to separate out the legal, political, educational, and cultural strands of school desegregation is impossible at this juncture. For that reason, it seemed most meaningful in conceptualizing this review to think of the literature as representing the country's growing pool of knowledge and beliefs about school desegregation. We have tried to judge the articles and books in terms of their informational context relative to the development of the desegregation movement rather than judging their content relative to some set of disciplinary standards such as soundness of research.

We have attempted to place the developments in a larger context. Research reports, for example, may stress or not stress findings depending, one might guess, on factors affecting the researcher. Similarly, one finds that some questions are asked while others are ignored just as court decisions are not necessarily the product of logical deduction from the legal charter. Our orientation has been to pay attention to changes in definitions and methods that pertain to desegregation and to guide the reader to sources which expand upon and reference particular topics.

Ultimately, it will be useful to analyze school desegregation in terms of its impact on American society and institutions. In the long run, it may become evident that the civil rights movement contributed to the decay of social stratification in American society; alternatively, its effects may be negligible, evidence only of the stability of the American dilemma. We believe that the place of the desegregation movement in history is not clear at this time, although, of course, there are many who have prophesied its consequences and there are social science theories which would generate a position. Instead, we have chosen to present the literature more in its own terms, that is, in terms of the issues and solutions as they have been and are conceptualized by those who have been active in affecting policy and practice.

I. 2. Sources and Format

In compiling a basic set of references on school desegregation, six types of sources were utilized. Two of these were computerized searches using the DIALOG Search Service (natural language searches). One search was of titles and abstracts present in the Educational Resource Information Center files (ERIC). The other was a similar search of Psychological Abstracts. Both searches used a set of twenty descriptors to locate relevant desegregation references. A third computerized search was done of Sociological Abstracts, using the facilities of the University of Georgia. Due to various complications, it was possible to search only one volume (21, 1973) of Sociological Abstracts. A fourth source of references was obtained from manual searches of the materials on hand at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill campus library. The fifth reference source was a series of bibliographies on school desegregation. These included Weinberg's (1970) compendium of 10,000 selected references on The Education of the Minority Child; (his newer edition was not available for use), De'Ath, Gibbons, and O'Neil's (1969) Black Education and Black Society in the United States: a Bibliography for Development Educators; the University of Florida Library's (1960, 1962) Segregation and Desegregation in American Education; Meyer Weinberg's (1967) School Integration: a Comprehensive Classified Bibliography of 3,100 References; and the bibliography from Ray C. Rist's (n.d.) forthcoming book concerning desegregation. In addition, Burnett's (1974) bibliography of Anthropology and Education sources was searched for anthropological sources on desegregation. Finally, various recent issues of journals devoted to desegregation-related topics were reviewed. (It should be noted that references which dealt solely with minority groups other than black Americans were eliminated from the set of sources.)

The resulting set of items, which numbered approximately 1500, was viewed as a sample of the literature from which basic trends in the literature could be ascertained. Counting on the fact that some important works might have been omitted in our initial search, we proceeded to develop categorizations of the literature and to obtain copies of material mentioned, but not included, among our original items.

As described above, we viewed the materials as indicative of conceptualizations of school desegregation and educational inequality as well as descriptive of events and positions relevant to desegregation. Thus, items in popular as well as academic journals were read in preparation of the overview.

The review is divided into six major areas. Discussions in each sub-section present overviews of particular areas, emphasizing trends in the conceptualizations and events relating to those areas. References are interspersed in the context of those overviews.

At the end of some of the sub-sections, more general references are mentioned by author and date. There has been no attempt to list all possible references for each area. Instead, the objective was to include: 1) examples of points of view and types of research, 2) major or central items, and 3) general references providing bibliographies for further reading. Published materials were given priority over unpublished materials.

The full reference for each item mentioned is listed alphabetically by author in the final reference section. Due to space limitations, only those items not described in the text which seem of particular value were annotated. Following each reference is a number indicating the sub-section(s) in which the reference is discussed.

II. FRAMEWORKS: GENERAL PERSPECTIVES ON SCHOOL DESEGREGATION

School desegregation symbolizes far more to Americans than the elimination of laws requiring school segregation. It symbolizes possible futures for individual children and for the country. These visions of the future brought about by integration give meaning to the events that occur and have occurred in the process of school desegregation. They provide the context in which courses of action are evaluated, research questions are formulated, alternatives are weighed, and policy is developed.

Twenty years ago, the ideals symbolized by school desegregation were not completely articulated and the means for achieving the transformation were nowhere spelled out. As the means were developed and tried, concepts underwent reinterpretation and refinement. Perspectives on school desegregation changed and diversified.

In spite of the proliferation and changes in perspectives associated with school desegregation, it is possible, through some oversimplification, to trace the development of three distinctive perspectives which have informed the action of those involved in struggles over school desegregation. These perspectives are described below under the rubrics of "forced integration/forced busing", "the American Creed", and "the promise of *Brown*".

The perspective which can be associated with most of the proponents of school desegregation is labeled "the American Creed", because of its emphasis upon the egalitarian principles of the society as the over-arching motivation for school desegregation. Representing the mainstream position, this perspective appears to be the one held by many of the members of the judiciary, social scientists, "liberal" whites, and active civil rights groups such as the NAACP (National Association for the Advancement of Colored People) who have been active in promoting school desegregation. These groups and individuals see themselves as on the offensive against anti-desegregationists whose perspective is labeled "forced mixing/forced busing".

Segregationists in the South resisted school desegregation. Currently desegregation is being resisted in some other regions of the country where busing is used as a means of achieving school desegregation in residentially segregated areas. Although those who protest busing are not popularly considered to be segregationists, their viewpoints are similar enough to those of the segregationists that they can, without too much violence to their position, be placed in the same category.

Proponents of the third perspective, labeled "the promise of _Brown_", are predominantly black people* who became discouraged with the progress of school desegregation. Diverging from the "American Creed" perspective, these individuals, who include black social scientists, educators, and civil rights and community leaders, have turned away from visions of America as a unitary society to visions of America as a culturally and structurally plural society.

In the fourth section, the three perspectives are collapsed yet again as alternatives of a single paradigm.

---

*A review of school desegregation as it has affected non-black minority groups is outside the scope of this paper.

II. 1. Forced Mixing/Forced Busing

To segregationists the Brown decision meant that white children would be forced by law to associate with people whom the segregationists considered morally, intellectually, and physically inferior. They were afraid their children would suffer spiritual, mental, and perhaps physical harm as a result of desegregation. In public, however, segregationists did not propound these racist views as much as they pointed to the aspect of imposition. They argued that Supreme Court justices had usurped the law-making power of Congress, establishing their own political and social views as the law of the land. ("The Southern Manifesto" of 1956 is included in Humphrey 1964.) When the federal agencies became involved in enforcement, the white southerners again complained, claiming that administration demands were illegal and disruptive of local systems (Orfield, 1975). Along with force, the Southern segregationists later included in their position the theme of unfair treatment of the South. Although under a special obligation to desegregate because of the use of state power to promote and maintain segregation, the constituencies of the Southern congressmen and senators began to complain of the relative lack of enforcement of segregation remedies in the urban North and West. On this basis, Southern senators in 1968, for example, demanded that half of the enforcement efforts conducted by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare be aimed at non-Southern cases.

The shift of emphasis on enforcement of desegregation to the urban North and West, which began to occur in the late 1960's, stimulated opposition in those areas which to some degree has been more successful than the resistance encountered in the South. The public outcry in these

Northern areas has taken a different form than in the South, however. While white people in the North, according to their verbalized statements, tend to be more accepting than Southern whites of the idea of black students in their children's schools, they have resisted the buses which transport the students from segregated neighborhoods. Interestingly, certain segregationist themes are apparent in the ideas of some so-called non-segregationists. Two of the myths held by white and middle-income parents, which Sullivan (1968) lists as those associated with desegregation, are fears that social race and social class integration will result in educational degradation for the middle- and upper-class whites and that violence will threaten the safety of the students. Similarly, the notion of cultural deprivation which posited educational, cultural, and behavioral "gaps" between the advantaged (usually white middle- and upper-income) and the disadvantaged (usually low-income and often minority) could be seen as a refined "scientific" version of some of the segregationists' ideas about the inferiority of black people. The main difference seems to lie in the permanence of the attributed inferiority. The cultural deprivationists thought the gaps could be narrowed, whereas the segregationists posited no basis for change. The nature of the urban resistance to plans to achieve desegregation which focused upon "forced" busing was also foreshadowed by Southern public outcry over the use of force. (See NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund 1973 on the busing controversy.)

For a period during the 1960's, desegregation for those who did not desire black-white mixing became associated with "the law of the land"; they thus assumed that desegregation would have to be accomplished sooner or later. During this period, national support for enforcement of desegregation was high. All three branches of federal government and a great deal of popular support coalesced for a period behind civil rights and school desegregation. The tide of this national support crested in 1964-1966 and then receded. Nixon's policies did not continue the movement's momentum and in fact tended to reverse it. Since 1969, forestalling desegregation through "legal" means, especially in the urban areas, has continued to be possible. Meanwhile, for some areas that have already desegregated, the 1974 School Aid bill opened the possibility that the pressure to maintain desegregated schools will be reduced. A section of the bill allows a court or agency to declare that the results of intentional segregation have been eradicated, and that, in effect, the officials are freed from responsibility for resegregation in case of population movement. When legislators and presidents began taking an active part in advising enforcement agencies in certain cases, busing, permissible resegregation, and the segregated neighborhood school acquired roles as political footballs. The aura of law which had become associated with school desegregation dissipated in the midst of political maneuverings.

II. 2. The American Creed

The "mainstream" or predominant perspective on school desegregation, held by most of the individuals who have been active in promoting school desegregation, is often couched in terms of American ideology. Especially in the beginning stages, school desegregation was spoken of in light of egalitarian principles propounded as the bedrock of American society. Since that period this position has undergone a number of reconceptualizations, changes in emphasis, and, to some extent, a fragmentation. This perspective and its changes over time are outlined below.

The discrepancy between American ideology and the realities of the society's treatment of black citizens was articulated by Myrdal (1944) as "an American dilemma." Discrimination on the basis of skin color was protested as being inconsistent with the egalitarian principles of the society. The Supreme Court in the 1954 Brown decision symbolized to some that the United States would be brought closer to the ideals which it professed: an open and democratic society in which equal opportunity for all is a reality. The disgrace of a legally-supported caste-like system would be eliminated and the terrible psychological damage done to black children would be halted.

Some attention has been devoted to predictions of long-run costs of apartheid to the society in terms of violence and debilitating exploitation as a whole (see, for example, Levine 1969), but a more predominant theme has been the evils of discrimination, prejudice, and racism as they affect the non-white portion of the population. The Brown case brought to national consciousness the inequality of black education in states where blacks were barred by law from attending schools with whites - an incontestable indication of the stigma of blackness. Vividly portrayed on national TV as well, in the early 1960's, was the sight of peaceful civil right demonstrators lead by Dr. King being attacked by dogs and fire hoses. At this time, blacks as the victims of Southern social injustice became prominent as a national concern.

The remedial efforts required by the courts adjudicating school desegregation cases were based upon the illegality of school segregation and associated assumptions about the damaging nature of apartheid institutions for blacks. In these cases black-white mixing, and in some cases racial balance, evolved as the standard which systems previously segregated by law had to meet to show that the illegal dual system had been eliminated. The courts came to require outcomes concretely visible in the form of the presence of black and white students in the same school building. Tangible results were required because stated policies of equal opportunity could not be trusted. It was found that color-blind laws, such as freedom of choice attendance plans, had few results since whites resisted even "token desegregation" through various formal and informal means, causing blacks to be apprehensive about leaving relatively safe segregated schools to enter racially tense desegregated schools. As a result of the courts insistence on mixing, white schoolmates became identified as a necessary component of the provision of equal educational opportunity for black children (Edmonds 1973).

This trend was affected by the Coleman, et al. (1966) government-funded nationwide survey of school conditions and student achievement. Coleman's study had a large impact on the development of the concept of equal education opportunity. For one thing, the Coleman report drew specific attention to the distinction between educational resources and educational outcomes. Prior to the 1960's the schools were seen as a resource provided to the public. At that time, equal opportunity meant equal access to equivalent schools. During the 1960's, the definition shifted to mean access to equal effects (see Section III). (Coleman 1968 attributes the explicit emphasis on equal outputs as opposed to equal imputs to the Office of Education's survey on equal education opportunity in 1966. (See also White 1974 and Mosteller and Moynihan 1972.) Better educational opportunity for blacks became associated with closing the educational achievement gap between blacks and whites.

Secondly, the Coleman report undercut what some desegregationists had considered to be a major reason why black children in segregated schools did poorly. Coleman's findings did not support the belief that black schools were inferior in facilities. Instead they seemed to indicate that black and white schools in each region of the country were roughly equivalent in terms of facilities; that white children had higher scores on achievement tests than black children in each region of the country, and that the small differences which did exist among schools did not seem to account for differences in performance.

In an article assessing the developments following Brown, D. Cohen (1974:40) makes the following observation:

> Brown was epochal not simply because of its impact on race relations, but because it was a remarkable synthesis of diverse ideas about equality, race, and education.

As Cohen goes on to point out, this synthesis was wrenched apart. The breakdown of the synthesis was especially acute for researchers affected by Coleman's survey. If differences between black/white educational outcomes were not explained by schools, then how were they to be explained? A variety of different ideas came to the fore, including genetic inferiority, social and cultural inferiority, and cultural differences. Coleman's data seemed to support the position that family and community background were of major importance. This view was compatible with a major remedial program instituted in the War on Poverty.

One of the thrusts of President Johnson's poverty program was based upon the assumption that education could break the cycle of poverty by providing special education to children from disadvantaged home backgrounds. Eligibility for remedial programs was determined (until recently) by income level, thus including many of the black children since blacks are over represented among the poor. Compensatory education as these remedial programs were known, came to be conceptualized by some as an alternative to desegregation. If the quality of education for blacks could be improved through these remedial programs, then they would be able to participate equally in American society and the process of school desegregation would be unnecessary. Others (Cohen 1968) argued that both desegregation and remedial programs were necessary. (See Schwartz, et al. 1968 who discuss proposed alternatives to desegregation.)

On the one hand, Coleman's findings because they distracted attention from any link between social race,* segregation, and equal educational opportunity, opened the way for alternative explanations of lower black performance. On the other hand, his findings were taken by some as supporting the need for desegregation. His results did show some limited gains for black students in majority white schools. Secondly, his finding that peer group characteristics had an important effect on achievement was taken as an indication of support for desegregation since children with middle- and upper-income school peers tended to do better on achievement tests. The reasoning was that integration by social race would tend to produce social-class integration since blacks are predominantly from lower-income backgrounds and, thus, black scores would improve as a result of exposure to middle- and upper-class children.

---

*"Social race" or "color" is used whenever possible in place of "race" in order to distinguish between "race" as a biological concept pertaining to populations and "race" as a diffuse status characteristic used primarily in reference to individuals. (See Harris 1975.) "Social race" is used to refer to the latter meaning.

In the popular press, Coleman's findings also promoted a de-emphasis on the effects of purposive isolation or stigmatization. In its place, as a result of the over-simplification of the Coleman findings, grew the notion that all-black institutions were harmful for black students. Black institutions were inferior not because of lack of resources but because of lack of whites. The idea that mixture represented an end to segregation as well as a necessity for equal educational opportunity (outcomes) became even more firmly entrenched. As a result, "white flight" and related trends began to be perceived as a major problem because they decreased the number of whites in the desegregated schools. There were cautions given that demands for racial balance in places where the black percentage was over the "tipping point" would cause white flight and thus eliminate the possibility for black gains associated with desegregation. (See Coleman 1975 for example, who argues that white flight has important policy implications.)

It is difficult to ascertain how much the courts were affected by the Coleman findings and the reanalysis of his findings by Jencks, et al. (1972) which suggested that not only did school facilities not affect achievement, but that number of years in school did not correlate with adult income. The courts, in spite of these well-publicized findings suggesting the irrelevance of facilities and even education in general (to use a popular interpretation of Jencks' findings), continued to require desegregation and continued to consider cases calling for equalization of school facilities based on equal protection guaranteed by the Constitution. (See Section III.1.f.)

Support for desegregation also decreased in other quarters. Especially in the 1970's there was strong pressure in Congress to limit the powers of the courts to order busing. (See Section III.2.) Even the NAACP Legal Defense Fund, a constant proponent of desegregation, seems to have decreased its emphasis on desegregation as a goal.* Although it is difficult to assess the impact of these trends on the courts, the judiciary, in any event, continued to be responsive to black plaintiffs claiming violation of their Constitutional rights.

The amount of money funneled by the federal government into remedial programs, the subsequent development of compensatory education programs, and the preoccupation in scientific circles with Coleman's data overshadowed a realization that was quite clear to many blacks: namely, that being in the same school building does not assure acceptance as an equal. Soon the courts were faced with cases dealing with "second generation" problems or devices such as tracking which had the effect of segregating students within the same school building (see Section IV). There developed in this regard a distinction between the frequent attainment of mixed student bodies and the envisioned result of a school in which skin color was irrelevant. (See Pettigrew 1969b or Krovetz 1972, for example.) The term "desegregation" came to be used to refer to the former while the latter came to be referred to by some as "integration".**

---

*The NAACP Legal Defense Fund agreement to drop prosecution in Atlanta in return for guarantees of black positions is seen by Cohen (1974) as a reordering of priorities.

**Integration is used by others to refer to a situation in which all participate as equals with differences being respected. For an example of this definition see Sizemore (1972).

Research also contributed to another reconceptualization of desegregation, this time in accord with the courts. In the beginning, the courts focused primarily upon segregation that had formerly been sanctioned by law. There was a distinction made between de jure segregation and de facto segregation. The segregation in the South was associated with law. In the North and West, however, it was popularly assumed that segregation resulted not from law, but was de facto, a fortuitous consequence of residential patterns, immune to the Brown decision and therefore immune to federal enforcement mechanisms established in Congress. (See Orfield 1969b.) The basis for maintaining the distinction between de jure and de facto segregation has been seriously eroded by research which indicates that as far as effects on black children are concerned, de jure is difficult to distinguish from de facto segregation. The distinction between de jure and de facto segregation became even less tenable when it became clear that actions of school boards in such areas were, for all intents and purposes, often done to promote school segregation. (See, for example, Pettigrew 1969b.) The courts responded to this type of intentional segregation as they had to intentional segregation by statute. Desegregation was ordered.

The response to the desegregation of urban areas, which often involves busing, has been vociferous. As described in the previous section, there has been an outcry of protests in the Northern as well as the Southern cities.

The 1970's in particular have been an era of fragmentation of the "American Creed" perspective. To some degree the symbolic value of school desegregation as a step in the direction of realizing equality has been eroded and the ideal of equality as a result of efforts to translate it into measurable standards has become murky.

II. 3. The Promise of Brown.

For black people, Brown held promise for society in general but more importantly it held promise for their children. Brown seemed to promise better educational opportunities for black children. In 1954, black people could share with white "liberals" the dream of the United States as an open, democratic society which they hoped would be realized in their childrens' if not their own lifetime.

In pursuit of the anticipated future, groups such as the NAACP worked to bring compliance with the Supreme Court's decision and black children tried to take advantage of the opportunity created by the courts. Resistance to black attendance, in the form of indecision and inaction, economic and physical reprisals, and the inaction of the president and Congress to overcome white resistance, however, soon dispelled any expectations that securement of those guaranteed rights would come rapidly.

In the ensuing struggle, the realities of desegregation and equal educational opportunity as they were being defined by the courts and by federal programs failed to match original hopes. "Racial balance" did not seem very effective in eliminating discrimination or in producing better educational opportunities. (See, for example, Banks 1972.) To some it became increasingly clear that desegregation did not mean integration; that desegregation did not mean that whites would accept blacks as equals; that integration was not feasible given white racism; and that even desegregation as defined by the courts would be slow in coming.

Desegregation as it was evolving was seen as just another routine of the same act of enforcement of white superiority. It was not a road to better educational opportunity, but in fact had succeeded in eliminating many of the teaching and administrative positions blacks had held (before desegregation). (See Billings 1972 for another association between desegregation developments and teaching jobs.) It was also based on assumptions that were now repugnant to some blacks, namely that black institutions were inferior and that black children must be associated with white children in order to learn. As CORE (the Congress of Racial Equality) articulated the evaluation: "Blacks who have gone along with integration have done so in search of dignity, but have found humiliation at the end of the rainbow" (1973:316). Some even began to ask whether the education offered by the schools, particularly the values stressed in the schools, were really what they wanted their children to learn (Hamilton 1968).

The "remarkable" switch from Civil Rights Movement to Black Power is not so remarkable when perceived in this light. Black spokespeople began to consider alternatives to desegregation for achieving better education. (See Bell 1970, 1975b, for example.) The crucial element did not seem to be access to white school buildings. The route to equality instead now seemed to lie in access to power over schools. (Again, see Congress of Racial Equality 1973, for example.)

The sharing of power suggested to some that there must be a structural change in how institutions are administrated and how decision-makers are designated. Administration must be reorganized to include more input from the local black community. "Community controlled" systems (see Section V. 3.)

became the desired outcome of those seeking structural change in decision making.*

At present there is no prominent symbol unifying support for the educational rights of minorities. Instead, the school bus is in ascendancy as the symbol of resistance to forced desegregation. It has been suggested that there is and has been a relative disunity among blacks since the mid 1960's when some of the direct-action civil rights groups became more militant. Plans for redistributing power such as described by Sizemore (1972) are quite complex and the efforts of black educators such as Sizemore to restructure school systems have not yet produced new unifying conceptualizations.

(See Bell 1970, 1975b for detailed descriptions of black disenchantment with desegregation.)

II. 4. A Broader Context

It is possible to put the three perspectives described above into a single context. Ogbu (n.d.), an anthropologist, in a comparative study of minority education in six societies, including the United States, argues that the future possibility for equal participation of a minority group in major institutions and equal access to resources affects the type of formal education they are provided as well as the type of socialization they receive in their homes. School desegregation and the frames of reference associated with it (described above) involve implicit it not explicit assumptions about the future participation envisioned for black Americans.

---

*It is interesting to note that community control plans were considered either counter to the goals of desegregation or not feasible by individuals having other perspectives, e.g. those holding the "American Creed". (See, for example, Cohen 1969 and Schwartz, et al. 1968.)

The ferment for change in minority status sparked by the Brown decision encompassed two basic typed of reformative visions: 1) assimilative and 2) pluralistic (see Rist 1974b.)

Assimilative approaches envision the integration of minority individuals into the mainstream institutions. The remedial policy seeks to open the way for the minority person through enculturation or acculturation into the mainstream culture so that he or she behaves as a non-minority person would. Through successful assimilation, the minority members would be absorbed and lose their distinctiveness.

The pluralistic vision, on the other hand, does not call for the elimination of distinctive groups. Pluralistic models vary in terms of the types of separation between groups, the degree of cultural distinctiveness, and the degree of shared control over public institutions that is envisioned. Models which emphasize the maintenance of distinctive cultural patterns (e.g., dialect) among groups are referred to as cultural pluralism. Models which emphasize the maintenance of separate institutions (e.g., schools) for each group are referred to as structural pluralism.

The assimilationist model can be associated with those who emphasize American egalitarian principles. Although the emphasis is upon equal treatment, remedial efforts are generated to minimize the difference between minority and non-minority individuals. Rist (1974b:61), in describing the assimilative approach includes the following:

> To operationalize this alternative [assimilation] for school integration, it would suggest there be few numbers of non-white children among many whites. In this way, there would be no danger of sufficient numbers of blacks or other non-white students having the opportunity to reinforce within their peer group any traits that would be perceived as non-white.

Cultural pluralists* pay more attention to cultural factors than do assimilationists. They seek the remodeling of the educational system so that it responds more favorably to cultural diversity. The goal of cultural pluralism is that minority group cultural patterns be respected, reinforced, and utilized in school while the child is also being prepared for equal participation in the dominant institutions which control adult life. (See Valentine 1971 for a refinement on this position.) An important question concerning cultural pluralism as it is now envisioned in education is whether multi-culturalism is feasible in an institution controlled and developed for individuals of the dominant background (Rist 1974b:62).

Alternatives to assimilative and cultural pluralistic approaches began to receive attention in the late 1960's, especially from black people discouraged with the failure of the promise of _Brown_ to materialize. Power was recognized as important, leading to the adoption of structural pluralistic models. Minority group members concerned with structural pluralism emphasize increased control over vital institutions affecting their lives. Separatism, the establishment of completely separate institutions and communities as advocated by Black Nationalists, was a route to increasing control which attracted attention in the late 1960's. (See Feagin 1971 on separatist models.)

---

*Most researchers and educators attracted by the argument that the achievement gap between blacks and whites is a result of cultural differences rather than deficits support cultural pluralism as a meaningful model for present and future America.

Segregationists, too, seek separate institutions and communities, but their vision includes maintenance of inferior and restrictive separate institutions for minority groups. They believe for various reasons (genetic inferiority, cultural deprivation, poor educational background, lack of motivation) that most minority individuals are unable or unwilling to assimilate. Non-segregationists who are concerned with power (some of whom are also separatists), on the other hand, advocate alternative educational institutions and/or alternative routes to achieving equal voice in controlling vital institutions. Community control and decentralization are seen by some as routes to structural pluralism. Others discuss the necessity for what may be an even more fundamental structural change before the promise of Brown can be realized. (See Valentine 1971 and Sizemore 1972.)

III. LITIGATION, LEGISLATION, AND ENFORCEMENT

The perspectives described in Section II are held by individuals who have influenced the direction of school desegregation as judges, as legislators, as local school officials, as rioters, as presidents, as researchers, as civil rights leaders, and as community leaders. These individuals participate in various governmental bodies and organizations each of which have their own history of participation in school desegregation. In this section, literature on the roles of governmental bodies and voluntary civil rights organizations is discussed. Two other sections, IV and VI, concern the contribution of researchers to desegregation, while section V focuses upon local community response to desegregation and to educational programs associated with desegregated schools.

III. 1. Litigation

III. 1.a. The Role of the Judiciary in School Desegregation

On May 17, 1954, referred to as "Black Monday" by the segregationists, the Supreme Court announced a unanimous decision striking down the Plessy v. Ferguson 1896 doctrine of "separate but equal" which allowed as Constitutional state statutes requiring or permitting apartheid schooling. Henceforth, the states were required to provide educational opportunities to all on equal terms. According to the Court, separate educational facilities were inherently unequal. (See Kirp and Yudof 1974 for discussion and commentary.) Thereafter followed a massive number of court cases dealing with whether violations of the law had occurred and what remedies were permissible in bringing relief to black citizens. In effect, the courts assumed a major burden, especially in the ten years following Brown, for devising standards for and seeing to the implementation of desegregation (see Read 1975).

In February of 1976, the National Institute of Education convened an international Symposium to explore the "increasing role of the courts in the formulation of educational policy at local, state, and federal levels." The recognition of the increased role of the courts is not new and has not gone unassessed. (See for example, Kirp and Yudof 1974.) Theoretically, the burden of implementation of the Brown decision and its progeny could have been, and in some cases was, undertaken by local and state officials on a voluntary basis. Certainly the congressmen and the presidents who held office in the period 1954-1974 had the authority to relieve the courts of more of their burden than they did. Resistance on the local and state levels, especially in the South where most of the Brown I cases had originated, and at the national level, however, threw the bulk of the responsibility upon the federal courts. The lower federal courts particularly were called upon to make decision after decision concerning the legality of efforts to avoid desegregation. At times the only other bodies devoted to the implementation of the law were civil rights organizations such as SNCC (Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee), SCLC (Southern Christian Leadership Conference), and most prominently, the NAACP Legal Defense and Education Fund which figured in financing and arguing many court cases. Local and state officials, for the most part, devoted their energy to stalling the desegregation process. School desegregation struggles cost a great deal of anguish, as well as lives in some cases. To some degree, they also diverted energy and money away from the development of new educational policy, programs, and facilities to accommodate desegregation.

This diversion of energy is well portrayed in congressional struggles over civil rights provisions in appropriations bills. Beginning in the 1950's, Congressman Adam Clayton Powell, Jr. attempted to bring about a provision to prevent the support of segregated districts by federal funds. After the short period of relatively strong national and executive support for civil rights which saw the passage of the 1964 Civil Rights Bill and a period of rather strong enforcement by HEW and the Justice Departments, Congress became an arena for efforts to curb desegregation momentum. This was primarily through anti-busing amendments attached to appropriations bills. The energy devoted to struggles over the anti-busing amendments were such that the main content or purposes of the bills were relatively ignored. In 1974, the Congress came close to approving amendments which would have brought them into confrontation with the Judiciary over desegregation.

It remains to be seen, now that the desegregation battle has shifted in earnest to the urban areas of the North and West and now that anti-busing forces have come so strongly to the fore, whether the courts will continue to play the same forefront role that they have in the last twenty years. Based upon the decision handed down in Milliken v. Bradley wherein the school district lines were accepted as the division beyond which the Court would not cross (barring further evidence) in proposing remedies to desegregation, some have predicted that the use of the Constitution alone as a means for achieving school desegregation has reached its limit. Others suggest that the decision against metropolitan desegregation plans is a product of a "Nixon-packed" court which will result in the prevention of major school desegregation in the urban North as well as the urban South. Thus, the current situation in which Southern public education is more desegregated than Northern public education may continue.

(Further references: Peltason 1961 describes the position of the judges of the Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit who were for the most part native Southerners put into the position of effecting a very unpopular policy. Bell 1975a suggests factors affecting the Court's Milliken decision. For accounts of the judicial struggle see Levin and Moise 1975, Read 1975, and Bell 1975b. Also see Orfield 1969b.)

III. 1.b. Desegregation **Cases in the South - De Jure Segregation**

The Brown decision of 1954 invalidated the use of the power of the state to promote and maintain dual schooling systems based upon social race. It did not, however, specify what would constitute evidence of a unitary system nor what methods would be permissible in achieving a unitary system. Neither did it provide a time frame for the conversion. Brown II, the implementation decision, basically handed the problem back to the lower federal courts although some vague directives such as the "all deliberate speed" clause were included. The possibilities were so great that a federal judge in South Carolina ruled on one of the "Brown" cases remanded to his court that the Constitution forbids discrimination but does not require integration. This minimum interpretation enunciated in the Briggs v. Elliot decision of 1955 was not laid to rest until 1966 (Read 1975).

The lower courts had been told that desegregation must take place but not how much must take place, how it must take place, what in fact constituted a violation of the law, or what political entity was responsible for getting the job done. The evolution of standards and criteria for judging the occurrence of a violation and for assessing the legality of a remedy has proceeded apace as forces for and against desegregation demanded answers from the court. The ingenuity of the pro-segregation forces in devising means of avoidance and the diligence of the voluntary associations formed to secure the promise of Brown pushed the courts to rule on many permutations and methods. The process still continues.

The more clear-cut violations of the law were found in the South where state statutes provided a legal foundation for the dual system. Cases brought for black plaintiffs were based on fairly obvious violations of the federal law. Nonetheless, court decisions in favor of the plaintiffs were met with resistance on the part of the local and state officials and vocal members of the white population. George Wallace's effort to bar Vivian Malone and James Hood from matriculating at the University of Alabama and the activities of the then Governor of Arkansas, Faubus, to bar entry to a Little Rock High School to eight black students through use of the Arkansas National Guard are symbols of the era of outspoken resistance to desegregation in the South.

From this period until the middle sixties, remedies accepted by the courts produced, at the maximum, only very limited visible results. The defendants in the Southern cases argued for "color-blind" or "racially" neutral policies, such as pupil placement laws and freedom of choice attendance plans which formally allowed, but did not require desegregation. These plans met what was first thought of as the intent of the law, but in actual practice as a result of white social and economic sanctions against black desegregators, did very little to promote any observable difference in school populations. These limited results came to be referred to as "token desegregation" as the number of students remaining in all black institutions became the most important criterion in desegregation cases.

In the middle and late 1960's, coinciding with a national concern with civil rights, the lower courts adopted a new stance. They turned away from accepting token desegregation to requiring massive desegregation. The cases of United States v. Jefferson County Board of Education and Singleton v. Jackson Municipal Separate School District were significant in this regard as was Green v. County School Board. These cases set the tone for ordering massive desegregation in which Brown was interpreted as charging the school authorities with eliminating racial discrimination "root and branch." The HEW (Department of Health, Education, and Welfare) guidelines for assessing compliance were given weight by the court as standards for compliance. Desegregation in the South, especially the rural South, proceeded at a rapid pace.

In the 1970's, the attention of the courts shifted to Northern and Western cases, most of which involved urban areas. Early images of school segregation stemmed from the rural South where white controlled local governments barred blacks from full participation by force of law. In urban areas, especially those in the North and West, the discriminatory actions of white-controlled governmental bodies have been less blatant and certainly not inscribed as a right in law books. The blurring of the distinction between de jure and de facto segregation, however, had produced a similar blurring of the distinction between segregation in the South versus the North. As the courts in the 1970's have moved to consideration of urban segregation in both the North and South, the North-South distinction has to some extent been replaced by a rural-urban distinction. Remedying rural segregation has proven to be less difficult than remedying urban segregation. (See Cohen 1974.)

(A number of sources are available which review school desegregation cases. Read 1975 provides a compact summary of cases from Brown to the present with some attention to social processes related to the cases. Levin and Moise 1975, in the same volume, instead of dividing the set of cases into four periods as Read does, discuss the issue in terms of legal questions. Carter 1955 lists pre-1955 cases which culminated in Brown. Blaustein and Ferguson, Jr. 1957 provide a description, for a general audience, of the "segregation cases," their legal background, and the parties involved. Peltason 1961 describes the plight of the judges of the lower federal courts upon whom the most pressure was put in the early implementation of Brown. Orfield 1969a,b; 1975, although focusing primarily on the legislative and executive branches, provides information on their points of contact with the actions of the judiciary - information often omitted in "case" accounts.)

III. 1.c. School Desegregation in the North and West - De Facto Segregation

Keyes v. School District No.1 (referred to as the Denver case) was the first non-Southern case to come before the Court. It was also the first case that clearly did not involve segregation mandated or permitted by state statute. De jure versus de facto segregation is a distinction popularly associated with desegregation cases. There continues to be the idea that segregation as mandated by racially explicit state laws can be and is distinct from segregation which occurs "naturally" or non-deliberately as a result of fortuitous social factors such as residential segregation. De facto segregation was thought to be immune from legal action requiring desegregation. (See, for example, Feldstein and Mackler 1969 and Hyman and Newhouse 1964.) This distinction became embedded in desegregation law with the Jefferson cases of 1966 and 1967 (Read 1975). At first sight, the Denver case might seem to be a case of de facto versus de jure segregation. The decision, in fact, maintained the de jure-de facto distinction but included under the rubric of de jure segregation that which results from the actions of governmental officials (including both education and non-education officials). The Supreme Court's decision endorsed similar lower court policies as ennunciated in the Pontiac case. These decisions decreased the number of cases which would be immune to court action as a result of being de facto (as opposed to de jure) segregation and there has yet to be a case in which the segregation has been found to be purely de facto. Actions which are taken as an indication of intent to segregate include the manipulation or gerrymandering of attendance zones to effect separatism, transfer policies which result in segregation, and the selection of school sites so as to maintain segregation of students by skin color. Disproportionate assignment of minority persons to schools disproportionately attended by minority pupils have also been considered evidence of violation of the law as is open enrollment, free transfer, and optional attendance zones which do not produce desegregation.

In the case of Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg County Board of Education decided in 1971, the Court, in a much awaited decision, ruled that although the current patterns of segregation were not due to current actions of the school board, they were the result of past practices of segregation and thus had to be remedied. Those awaiting the decision hoped for a clear statement on whether "racial balance" (representation proportional to the district population in each school) would be the standard for the extent of desegregation required. The decision, however, was equivocal. Some read it to indicate that in certain cases (of proven intent to segregate) racial balance is expected unless the district can show that it is not at all practical. Others read the decision to mean that racial balance is not necessarily required. Perhaps even more significantly, the use of extensive cross-town busing was granted as a permissible remedy.

Recently, the question of the extent of Court demanded remedy has received the most intense interest. The crucial question concerns the extent of the area which must be desegregated in the event that a violation is found. The doctrine of equity law holds that the nature and extent of the remedy are determined by measuring the violation and the extent of its effects. In Keyes, the Court ruled that district-wide remedies were appropriate even though the segregative actions occurred only in one part of the school system. The Court held that segregation in one part of the district had consequences for other parts of the district and thus that a district-wide remedy was appropriate.

The next landmark case was the Milliken v. Bradley decision rendered by the Supreme Court in 1974. The Supreme Court found that the practice of utilizing neighborhood schools where the residential patterns were definitely segregated, that the particular locations chosen for school construction, and that optional attendance zones (which permitted segregated patterns) had produced results from which it could be inferred that there was intent to segregate. In other words, segregation found in Detroit was judged to be de jure and therefore the responsibility of school authorities to remedy. On the other hand, in what has been identified by some as a retreat in the forward battle of the courts against segregation, the Supreme Court honored the school district lines which subdivide the metropolitan area of Detroit and shifted the burden of proof to the plaintiffs to show that actions of the suburban school officials or of state education officials were based upon intent to segregate. Reversing the lower courts, the Supreme Court refused to demand an interdistrict remedy.* (The decision, however, did suggest that state responsibility for desegregation might later become more emphasized.)

(Read 1975 and Levin and Moise 1975 provide reviews. Levin and Moise specifically focus upon the 1970's. Both articles also include short sections on the segregation of Hispano-Americans. Flannery 1972 provides explicit descriptions of actions considered to show intent to segregate. Abrams 1975 discusses violations in the Boston case. Chachkin 1972, an NAACP staff attorney, argues for metropolitan desegregation.)

---

* It is interesting to note that there is some element of fairness arising in the popular response to the question of metropolitan desegregation. Those making policy demanding urban desegregation are viewed as sending their children to private schools or as living in suburban districts untouched by the decisions. In a documentary on busing televised by CBS on May 29th, 1976, Edward Kennedy was shown talking with residents of a Boston Neighborhood disrupted by violence concerning busing. One of the residents comments could be overheard. He was telling Kennedy, "Bus your kids, Teddy. Bus your kids." Another example of this thinking is given in Taylor 1973:343, which makes reference to "limousine liberals", the middle- and upper-class individuals who look down at working class prejudices and call for desegregation while remaining ensconced in their homogeneous suburbs.

III. 1.d. School Finance Cases

One of the grounds upon which the Supreme Court objected to apartheid schooling was the denial of equal educational opportunity. The national impetus to desegregate schools was closely tied to, and to some extent overshadowed by, the goal of equal educational opportunity (see Sections II and IV). Cases involving components of equal educational opportunity other than racial composition have been brought before the courts as well. One of these areas which has been linked to the question of inequitable schooling for black children, particularly those from lower-income families, has to do with methods of school finance. The current method of school finance through property taxes is considered by some to be a structural means of discrimination against minorities.

The concern focuses upon the great differences that exist among school districts in per pupil expenditure. These differentials are linked to district wealth as measured by the value of property in the district. Districts with low property value must tax at a higher rate to get comparable tax revenues or settle for lower rates of per pupil expenditure. It is argued that differentials in district wealth produce differences in school expenditures affecting the efficiency and effectiveness of the schools. Poorer schools supposedly provide fewer social and economic benefits.

As with other reforms undertaken in the pursuit of equal opportunity, the concept of equity in school finance reform has undergone a series of redefinitions and reorientations. In some of the initial cases which were rejected by the coursts, the argument was phrased in terms of pupils' educational needs, a judicially unmanageable standard. Coons _et al._ (1970) proposed an alternative standard or basis for remediation of interdistrict resource inequality, "fiscal neutrality", whereby the correlation between district wealth and per pupil expenditure would be eliminated. Fiscal neutrality was seen as a step in the direction of eliminating inequality in education for poor children.

The best known court cases connected with school finance are _Serrano v. Priest_ ruled upon by the California Supreme Court in 1971 and _San Antonio Independent School District v. Rodriquez_, the first "fiscal neutrality" case to reach the United States Supreme Court. In _Serrano v. Priest_, the California Supreme Court accepted the "fiscal neutrality" approach as a standard. The Supreme Court, in 1973, however, reversed the lower court decision in the case of San Antonio Independent School District v. Rodriquez, ruling that the Texas method of school finance (largely based upon property tax) did not violate the equal protection clause of the constitution. The majority opinion was that the methods of finance are in need of reform, but that reform should be undertaken by lawmakers. State constitutions such as that in California do, in some cases, provide for "thorough and efficient" or "thorough and uniform" education thus making "fiscal neutrality" approaches more appropriate than property tax methods in meeting the legal requirements of the state.

Aside from analyses of the implications of school finance reform litigation and legislation, there have also been efforts to show that those who are affected by district poverty are often poor minority students. Spratlen (1973), for example, using data such as that provided in the Hobson report on Washington, D.C. schools attempts to show color disparity in terms of the greater economic disadvantage to inner city districts which have high proportions of black students. (See Coons, et al. 1970 for an alternative position - to which Spratlen 1973 objects.) Others dispute the assumption that poor districts necessarily have poor students and that students will benefit from a strict policy of fiscal neutrality. (See Cohen 1974 and Levin 1974, for example.) Cohen includes conclusions from Coleman, et al. (1966) and Jencks et al. (1972) which contradict arguments given in court that fiscal inputs are related to educational achievement and future life chances. (See Section IV.2.)

Background information and discussions of the implications of the school finance reform movement are presented in Pincus (1974); Kirp

(1973) discusses background of early school finance cases. (See also Coons, et al. 1970 for evolution of the fiscal neutrality approach.)

III. 1.e. The Courts and Second-Generation Problems

As the standards for desegregation evolved, figures indicating the social-race compositions of the district's schools became the usual criterion for ascertaining compliance with the law. At first, these compositions were considered on the basis of schools as a whole; however, it soon became evident that there were methods for intra-school discrimination which maintained separation of the children within the buildings. These methods of intra-school segregation are in a sense "second-generation" problems. One method is called tracking, streaming, or ability grouping whereby children of similar abilities or background are placed in the same class (often on the basis of standardized IQ tests). In the Hobson v. Hansen case, the plaintiff won. The decision rendered was that the tracking system used in the District of Columbia schools was unconstitutional because the method of student classification or assignment to tracks was biased. The decision is not a clear precedent, however, as the circuit court, on appeal, decided only that the type of tracking used in the District schools was invalid. The invalidity of all tracking systems was not enunciated.

Another second generation problem has to do with the disproportionate amount of suspensions and expulsions of black versus white students. In the Hawkins v. Coleman case decided in 1974, the court found that black students in Dallas did suffer more frequent suspensions longer suspensions, and more corporal punishment than the white students, especially when black students constituted minorities in their schools.

These second-generation problems which have sometimes been referred to under the rubric of "resegregation" have not been definitively responded to by the courts. They, along with questions concerning interdistrict remedies, constitute some of the legal unknowns concerning court involvement in school desegregation.

(See Section V.5 for further discussion of these methods of resegregation. See also Kirp and Yudof 1974 for a description of relevant cases as well as Levin and Moise 1975 who discuss the problem of separating, ascertaining, and verifying the educational utility of tracking versus the intent of the practice to segregate - as well as other complications of second generation problems. One problem depends upon the validity of the classification procedures some of which, e.g., standardized intelligence tests, are also under fire. Flannery 1972 also provides a discussion of second generation problems.)

III. 1.f. Private School Cases

In a sense, private schools are a second generation problem that has arisen in the course of attempts to circumvent desegregation. Initial efforts to forestall desegregation on the part of Southern legislatures included the tactic of providing tuition grants directly and indirectly to private institutions which were segregated. Cases concerning such devices were brought to court. One of the best known cases is Griffin v. County School Board of Prince Edward County which was decided in 1964. In 1959, the supervisors of Prince Edward County, Virginia, refused to levy taxes for schools. The public schools did not open in the fall of 1959 and remained closed until the year of the case.

Private schools were established for white students with support from the state via a tuition plan. (See Orfield 1969b for a description of the political context of the contested practices.) These attempts of the states to support segregated private schools were ruled unconstitutional.

The question of whether private schools may bar individuals on the basis of color without violating the Civil Rights Act or the Constitution has also been debated. A recent case on this question has been brought to the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals from eastern Virginia where the district court ruled the discrimination a violation of the 1966 Civil Rights Act.

A means more effective than court decisions for preventing private schools from formal segregation is found in laws providing that tax-exemptions permitted to private schools and for doners' contributions are not allowed in the case of segregated private schools. The 1974 report (Volume III) of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights (1975), in reviewing civil rights enforcement practices, criticizes the Internal Revenue Service administrators for their very narrow interpretation of the law. (The Commission report provides a thorough description of IRS's responsibilities, data collection procedures, and enforcement efforts.)

(See Kirp and Yudof 1974 for descriptions of the various cases. Champagne 1973 also describes some of the cases, avoidance techniques, and some early data on the spread of private schools. See Section V. 2.b. for further information on private schools.)

III. 2. Legislation

III. 2.a. The Role of Congress and the President in School Desegregation

The Brown decision required massive efforts for implementation. In 1954, the task of establishing administrative and enforcement machinery and the fleshing out of policy still lay ahead. Many of these tasks were ones appropriately taken up by Congress and the president in the event of default on the local level. Until 1964, the role of Congress and the president had been limited to situations such as the provision of federal troops by President Eisenhower to stop Governor Faubus and proclamations issued by President Kennedy in support of court ordered action. In 1964, President Johnson signed into law the Civil Rights Act which provided an expanded role for federal agencies in encouraging and enforcing school desegregation.

Congress and presidents working with Congress have relied primarily upon three means of promoting school desegregation: 1. laws regulating the activity of federal agencies in dispensing funds; 2. establishment of administrative machinery for review and enforcement; and 3. allocation of funds to assist in desegregation-related problems.

The employment of these measures has not been uniform. As mentioned above, the courts carried most of the burdens of implementing school desegregation, especially in the first ten years following the 1954 decision. With the passage of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, some of the resources of the Department of HEW and the Justice Department were brought to bear on school desegregation. Those mechanisms, however, have been less utilized since 1968-69 when the efforts of Congress and the president turned to struggles over limiting the roles of HEW and the Justice Department in utilizing the powers originally established in the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

A more diffuse influence of Congressional and Executive activity upon school desegregation has been suggested by Orfield (1975). Busing has attracted a great deal of political attention in the last five years. Desegregation has become associated primarily with the portrayals constantly reiterated and reinforced by anti-busing congressmen and presidents. Instead of leaders serving to inspire the country during a difficult period of social and cultural change, the late 1960's and 1970's have seen an emphasis upon negative aspects of those changes. To some degree, the fears and negative views of particular segments of the population have been championed in the public arena. (See Section II for more on particular viewpoints.) Instead of focusing upon positive outcomes, "forced busing" has become a political focus encouraging the public to question the legitimacy of court orders. The primary burden of implementing Brown has been passed back to the courts.

(For references on specific areas, see Sections III. 2.b. and III. 2.c. For detailed descriptions of the Congressional role see Orfield 1969b,1975.)

III. 2.b. Civil Rights Legislation and School Desegregation

Federal agencies have traditionally had a limited role in education as compared to local and state governments. The expansion of that role was strongly contested in Congress especially by powerful Southern Congressmen and Senators. The 1954 decision by the Supreme Court meant that a number of school systems were operating illegally yet federal money continued to flow to those illegal systems. Efforts by Congressman Adam Clayton Powell to amend appropriations so that this support could no longer be supplied were defeated time after time. Not until 1964 when the crest of national support for civil rights was at its height was it possible to get a restrictive provision through Congress. That legislation, the Civil Rights Act of 1964, began what has been called the "administrative era" of school desegregation.

Some of the important aspects of the 1964 Civil Rights Act include the following: Title IV of the Act required the Commissioner of HEW to make technical assistance available to local school boards which were in the process of preparing school desegregation plans. Title IV authorized the Attorney General to bring desegregation suits on behalf of potential plaintiffs who otherwise had no recourse to sue on their own behalf, thus making available the resources of the Department of Justice for desegregation litigation.

Laying the groundwork for an enforcement device which was quite effective, Title VI proscribed discrimination in any program or activity receiving federal financial assistance, under threat of loss of funding The act ordered that:

> No person in the United States shall on the grounds of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program of activity receiving Federal financial assistance.

Title VI provided an impetus for the establishment of offices within HEW charged with determining compliance of school districts appying for federal funds.

The Act brought an expansion of HEW. Prior to 1964, the Office of Education was fairly powerless (see Kirp and Yudof 1974:328). The process of preparing for enforcement was difficult as was the development of guidelines, given strong pressures from both civil rights groups and local officials. At one point, one of the chief consultants, George Foster (1965), resorted to writing an unofficial article in the Saturday Review as a means of communicating what seemed to be developing agency guidelines on standards.

Since most of the administrative machinery of the American educational system is located at state and local levels, the method of withholding funds was practically the only enforcement mechanism that could be wielded by the federal government. The threat of denial of funds was effective and brought about much faster compliance than the case-by-case method of the court process. Orfield (1975:85) points out that more black students attended desegregated schools in the first year of enforcement of the 1964 Civil Rights Act than during the previous ten years. There were drawbacks, however. In some cases, the elimination of federal support meant the elimination of programs designed to help those whom desegregation was supposed to aid. The method also opened the agency to political attacks.

After the height of effort in the mid 1960's, congressional and executive support for school desegregation waned. Efforts to limit administrative enforcement activity have been debated in Congress annually since 1966. Desegregation was an issue in the 1968 Presidential election. When Nixon took office in 1968, he reversed the trend toward strict enforcement. The resources were disengaged and officials were encouraged by Nixon and by pressure from some members of Congress not to press for enforcement. In Congress there continued to be efforts to limit the conditions under which HEW could withhold or cut off funds. The Justice Department's prodesegregation stand was diverted and, in fact, the Department was used in the service of those dsiring to delay desegregation. Justice lawyers went to the Supreme Court in the Alexander v. Holmes case to request a delay in the desegregation order.

Enforcement procedures became highly politicized by Nixon (Orfield 1969a,b) and the aura of inevitability of desegregation which had begun to develop in the 1960's dissipated. Although the first statement in statutory law of any affirmative duty to desegregate appeared in the 1974 education bill extending the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, that bill contained little in the way of measures to promote desegregation. Its formulation had taken place in a heated struggle over the anti-busing amendments which, if they had not been defeated, would have limited actions which could be ordered by the courts. Those amendments were only narrowly defeated.

(For description of the development of the administrative staff and procedures up through the late 1960's, see Orfield 1969b. For criticisms of the enforcement procedures, see Southern Regional Council 1969 and the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights reports, especially 1975.)

III. 2.c. Federal Aid to Fducation

In 1965, Congress enacted the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). The bill, a $1.3 billion measure, was the first significant piece of federal legislation in the area of general aid to education in the nation's history. Historically, the Federal government has played a limited role in education finance. The act provided a number of basic education programs, channeling a good deal of money into public schools serving low-income students. These funds were important sources of revenue especially during a period in which per pupil expenditures were rising even faster than the cost of living. Together with the provision for delaying and eliminating funding to segregated districts passed in the 1964 Civil Rights Act, ESEA provided pwerful inducements to desegregate. State departments of education expanded through ESEA funds and became more dependent on federal funds (Campbell and Layton 1968).

As referred to above, the fight in Congress over the extension of ESEA programs provided an area for a terrific struggle over the future of desegregation. President Nixon and a good number of senators and representative pushed strongly for anti-busing proposals to be written into the extensions. The bill was finally passed and signed by Nixon's successor, Ford, inspite of its lack of stringent anti-busing requirements.

In addition to preventing the inclusion of stringent anti-busing provisions, the civil rights advocates in Congress did manage to secure some support for desegregation. The bill contained the first statement in statutory law of any affirmative duty to desegregate. It also forbade gerrymandering for the purpose of segregation.

The anti-busing anti-desegregation forces, on the other hand, won some concessions from or managed to neutralize some of the foreward momentum of the desegregation measures. In the past the school boards continued to be liable to further court suits as new legal developments occured or as population shifts resulted in non-compliance with guidelines. The education bill signed into law in 1974 made it possible for a presiding judge to declare a case closed - in other words, to declare that all vestiges of de jure segregation had been eliminated and, thus, that the court had no further jurisdiction over the school board. Intentional segregation would be liable to prosecution, but changes brought about through population shift would be ignored, thus allowing resegregation.

To date, the efforts to curb busing as a means of desegregation have not been successful. The anti-desegregationists, however, did manage to limit the courts and HEW enforcement practices by prohibiting the courts and HEW from requiring mid-year pupil transfer to effect desegregation. Further, the procedure and the time period preceding the cut-off of funds was lengthened. HEW was also forbidden to order a school system to implement a plan requiring "extensive" busing. Although this may not be binding upon HEW since HEW does not order the implementation of any plan, it can be and has been cited by an HEW official as a reason for failure to demand compliance.

Federal aid to education also played another role in school desegregation. In the late sixties, when the courts had ordered immediate, massive desegregation in areas of the South, Nixon promised to provide federal money to aid in the transition. This was done in the form of the Emergency School Assistance Program (ESAP). Congress approved immediate dispersal of seventy-five million dollars through existing programs. Because of the pressure for haste, applications were not carefully scrutinized and, as a result, money was not always spent on desegregation-related costs. In fact, the money was more-or-less given away which may have eased some of the pain felt by segregationists over losing the battle against desegregation. Over two periods of extension and struggle of the emergency program, it was shaped into a less amorphous program with standards that did provide some incentives for desegregation.

(See Eidenberg and Morey 1969 and Meranto 1967 for detailed descriptions of passage of the 1965 ESEA. See Orfield 1975 for brief descriptions of the passage of the initial ESEA and ESAP appropriations. A more extended coverage of the 1974 Congressional struggle over ESEA is given in Section VI of Hillson, et al. 1969 who provide some early examples of how educators conceptualized the purpose of the federal money made available to the districts. An evaluation study of ESAP is presented in Crain 1973. See Campbell 1967 for a description of the then contemporary conceptualization of federal entry into education. Campbell and Layton 1968 provide a brief analysis of the extent and impact of federal entry. For evaluation of compliance of districts receiving Title I ESEA funds with program requirements, see Southern Center for Studies in Public Policy and the NAACP Legal Defense and Education Fund 1969 and National Advisory Council on the Fducation of the Disadvantaged Children 1967; for a similar evaluation of federally funded Indian education programs, see NAACP Legal Defense and Education Fund 1971.)

III. 3. Civil Rights Organizations and the Genesis and Implementation of School Desegregation

Elimination of intentional segregation has proceeded as a result of voluntary effort, implementation of court ordered desegregation, and induced compliance wherein districts were threatened with loss of funds. The federal courts cannot bring suits, thus, it was left to private citizens and voluntary groups to sue for relief if the local authorities were resistant. In order to gain their constitutional rights, private citizens, with the support of some civil rights group such as the NAACP Legal Defense and Education Fund, brought suit against school officials. Private citizens and groups were relieved of the burden to any great extent only during the short period when the federal systems set up to effect desegregation were being supported by the president and Congress during the mid 1960's.

Two crucial aspects of federal agency pressure were the passage of legislation, the 1964 Civil Rights Act, and the establishment of enforcement machinery and guidelines authorized by the act. The passage of the Civil Rights Act with a powerful enforcer, Title VI, had been pushed in Congress by Representative Adam Clayton Powell since the 1950's, but always blocked by Southern segregationists. Federal money continued to go to support illegal systems. As late as early 1963, President Kennedy saw no possibility that a Title VI type provision could be passed. The Civil Rights Movement, with its sit-ins and demonstrations was, however, during that period bringing black oppression to televisions and newspapers across the country. The local white police reaction to the Birmingham demonstration organized by Martin Luther King, Jr., symbolized and gave meaning to the black struggle in the South. Confrontation with a clear symbolic portrayal of white oppression of blacks crystalized national opinion for civil rights and against Southern apartheid.

The three major direct action Civil Rights organizations, CORE, SCLC, and SNCC, which had been formed in the 1940's and 1950's expanded enormously. Besides the demonstrations that garnered national support for the Civil Rights Act, voluntary civil rights groups also had influence in helping to establish the momentum for HEW enforcement policies. The NAACP Legal Defense and Education Fund joined together with AFSC (the American Friends Service Committee) to form a Task Force which helped spread information to communities and put pressure on the Office of Education (OE) to establish meaningful guidelines. The Task Force, SNCC, and other civil rights groups monitored enforcement activities and encouraged OE not to submit totally to the desires of local school persons in the South.

In the late 1960's, some of the action-oriented civil rights groups, such as CORE, became more militant, rejecting integration as irrelevant. The remarks of leaders of these groups and the riots that were occurring in Watts, Detroit, and other larger cities provided a new symbolization of black hopes which frightened whites. As a result, national support for desegregation measures which had been strong during the King era lessened.

(Adams and Burke 1970 provide an encyclopedia-like description of people, organizations, and events involved in the Civil Rights

Movement. Positions of some of the civil rights advocates are available in the transcription of a national forum included in Howe, et al. 1970. For examples of reports of enforcement activities and the misuse of federal funds see Southern Center for Studies in Public Policy and the NAACP Legal Defense and Education Fund 1969; NAACP LD and EF 1971; and Rodgers and Bullock 1972. The Southern Regional Council, a civil rights research group funded by foundations, also has provided a monitoring function as has the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. See reports issued by the Southern Regional Council, Inc. 1969, such as the "Special Report: The Federal Retreat in School Desegregation," which describe the general trends in enforcement, the techniques utilized, and the politicization of the process. Particular cases are described in some detail. U.S. Commission on Civil Rights reports may be obtained through ERIC.)

III. 4. Role of Social Science Research in the Desegregation Process

There are two areas in which applied research on social problems has played a role in the process of desegregation. The more questioned has been the use of social science data in court cases. The famous footnote eleven in the Supreme Court's Brown decision cites evidence amassed by the psychologist Kenneth Clark and others which pointed to the psychological harm rendered black children by the Plessy doctrine of separate but equal. The role of this extra-legal evidence in court cases continues to be debated. Clark has argued the importance of social science data in establishing the link between segregation and inequality while others have denied it. (See, for example, Clark's 1959 response to Cahn 1955; see also Van den Haag 1960 who denies the importance of the Clark data.)

Probably the most frequent counter argument is that the decision was based on societal norms suggested in the Constitution which forbid differential privileges irregardless of whether lack of access to the privileges has an adverse effect. (For a discussion relevant to this issue see Kirp and Yudof 1974:297-299.)

Judge Wisdom (1975) in reviewing the opinions of others on the admissibility of social science evidence concludes that courts primarily use social science evidence to lend a factual and scientific aura to a result sustainable on other bases. (See also Levin and Moise 1975.) He argues that in thinking about cases judges commonly use assumptions similar to hypotheses presented in sociological journals which may or may not be explicitly researched. Craven (1975:156) summarizes a similar point:

> Just as a raconteur will seldom let the facts interfere with a good story, judges seem to have seldom allowed sociology to interfere with a good theory - until the time of a new idea has come. Sometimes it is a long time coming; but when it arrives, it is then woven into the constitution fabric.

Aside from the original Brown decision, social science data as such have been admitted in desegregation cases to show that various policies resulted in segregated schools. It has also been admitted in the important area of devising remedial measures. Pettigrew, for example, has been called to testify in cases where remedies have been protested because of the possibility of provoking "white flight." Pettigrew (1972) has testified regarding his research that the black-white ratio affects educational achievement and that without sufficient numbers of whites, desegregation may have negligible effects on black educational achievement. Some courts reject this information on the basis of legal precedent which says probable resistance should not prevent protection offered by the 14th amendment (see Craven 1975).

Glazer, in the foreward to Kirp and Yudof (1974), suggests that the "marriage" of law and social science has occurred and will continue because legal questions involving policy necessarily involve questions of effect which the courts are not accustomed to predicting. The role of social science in court cases, however, is not yet firmly established. Some jurors, as cited above, consider such data to constitute supporting evidence only, others consider research as irrelevant to the legal questions involved, and others as contributing more to confusion than clarification. In any event, individuals in the judiciary are probably, at the least, affected by social science research indirectly to the extent that findings become "common knowledge."

The second area in which social science research has had a major impact upon desegregation has been in assessing causes and evaluating educational programs. These studies have included extensive research such as that undertaken by Coleman, et al. (1966) to ascertain the major determinants of inequality and evaluation research of the remedial programs undertaken by the federal government, particularly "compensatory education" programs and the educational outcomes of desegregation itself. The legitimacy of this use of social science is not questioned, but to some degree the susceptibility of social science findings to political manipulation is. Research on educational outcomes, for example, in what have been called desegregated settings, do not readily support the notion that simple desegregation will improve educational outcomes for black children (see Section VI). These findings along with other studies purporting to show other factors as influencing black outcomes, it is sometimes suggested, have provided a rationale for those who wish to muffle efforts to desegregate the North and West as well as the urban areas of the South.

Concerning such studies, particularly those undertaken by Jensen (1969) and Jencks, et al. (1972), Clark (1973:78) points out:

> All of the more publicized social science research and theories - and the acceleration of concern of social science with problems which have direct educational policy implications - came in the wake of the Brown decision, and became part of the political controversy surrounding the desirability, the methods, and the rate of public school desegregation.

Clark goes on to suggest that much of the research and many of the theories which proliferated in the post-Brown era did not focus upon the social science findings cited by the Court in Brown, but rather postulated other reasons for the academic and psychological inferiority of black students. Some of these emphases such as genetic inferiority would, of course, have implications counter to Brown and were in fact cited in some court cases as reasons for opposing or disregarding the implications of the Supreme Court decision.

Clark's analysis places the desegregation research subsequent to Brown in political relief. He is not the only author to suggest political motivations behind the support of researchers pursuing determinants other than discrimination. (See Edmonds, et al. 1973, for example.) An early essay by Long (1955) argued that the criteria for choice of desegregation research should be derived consistent with the spirit of Brown.

Long's article is interesting not only because it points out the politically charged nature of desegregation research at an early stage, but also because it provides an argument that black social scientists would be more likely to ask questions appropriate to the Supreme Court mandate of elimination of apartheid schooling than would white researchers. An assertion which became popular especially in the late 1960's was that social scientists, educators, and program developers who were white were not appropriate as students of or administrators of programs and policies developed to alleviate the problems of low-income, black, or other minority individuals and groups. A strand of this ideology is suggested by Long (1955:205) in the following:

> The orientation of Negro and white educators and social scientists is doubtlessly somewhat different; one group accepting and being motivated by the equalitarian ideology, and the other accepting the ideology with qualifications based upon status considerations, expediencies and tradition. . . . There appears to be an inclination for Negro spokesman to under-estimate the difficulties of change and for the white "liberals", including educators and social scientists, to over-emphasize the difficulties.

Both Long and Clark, and of course many others, recognize the importance of research findings as a medium of debate in policy formation. While some, however, would argue that because of the social and political structure only a limited number of questions are asked, others discuss the manner in which findings feed back on policy. Cohen and Garet (1975) explain the impact of research findings not as impinging in a logical way on policy and program development but rather as entering into the general body of knowledge and beliefs upon which social policy is based. Long (1955) presents the same argument in terms of black-white relations, arguing that research plays an important role in integrating and socializing the relationships between blacks and whites.

Published descriptions of the conditions of the potential recipients of social policies have played an important role in this area. Some of these works became general reading as well, communicating to the public at large some of the same images which were helping to form the social policy from which programs would be generated. Some publications in this tradition are Conant (1961) who focused upon the problems faced by urban schools and Clark's (1965) Dark Ghetto which provided a description, often in the words of inhabitants of Harlem, of what life is like under impoverished conditions. Portraits vary as to what aspect of the problem they reveal. Riessman (1962) contains descriptions of the child for whom compensatory education programs were devised while the observational field studies of Rosenfeld (1971) and Rist (1973), for example, present in compelling form structural aspects of urban schools which doom some students to failure.

Probably the greatest impact of social science research on desegregation policy has come from the study reported in Coleman, et al. (1966) and the subsequent analyses and reanalyse of Coleman's school and achievement data. Social scientists, especially nationally known ones such as Moynihan (1969) attribute the Coleman data with shaping conceptualizations of equal education opportunity and with affecting the course of desegregation policy by destroying some widely held beliefs about why black children do poorly in school. These arguments are reviewed in Sections II.2. and IV. Desegregation-related research has in some cases supported or reinforced certain visions of society while in others it has called into question certain tenets of such world views (see Jencks, et al. 1972). The policy of compensatory education, for example, which emerged during the era of the War on Poverty provided the charter upon which a number of educational programs such as Head Start and Follow Through were undertaken by the Government. Adherence to that frame of reference has been undermined, Cohen and Garet (1975) suggest, by evaluation research on the early intervention programs such as Head Start which are counter to the predicted results. As a result, there is decreasing confidence in the previously widely accepted importance attributed to early intervention and to methods designed to stimulate early conceptual development. The assumptions upon which the policy rests have been undercut and support for the programs has decreased even though the programs are politically popular and the next logical step would be to expand them to all eligible children. Whether a covert policy has produced these findings or the findings have affected policy is an issue under debate.

An interesting sideline to the role of research in desegregation is the clash among social science disciplines in the methodologies and analytic approaches which have been highlighted. (See, for example, controversies concerning Coleman's analysis of the 1966 data referred to in Section IV.) Government money has gone to support a great deal of desegregation research which has stimulated the interests and efforts of researchers from many fields thus providing another arena for conflict: the favorite methods and variables of different disciplines. This interplay has brought changing emphases in the research so that some of the research questions have been reformulated. The onslaught, for example, on the validity of standardized intelligence tests as a means of classifying students has raised questions concerning the advisability of the use of standardized tests as the primary measures for assessing educational outcome as affected by desegregation and compensatory education programs.

The use of social science research in court cases may have also had an interesting outcome, that of encouraging what Rivlin (1973) has referred to as "forensic social science" wherein the traditional posture of objectivity and impartiality on the part of the social scientist is abandoned in favor of a very clearly stated position for or against a particular policy. The best case possible is made with the notion in mind that another scholar or team of scholars will undertake to demolish the case with counter evidence. Rivlin cites as a clear example, Guthrie, et al. (1971) and also suggests that Jencks, et al. (1972) would fall into a similar genre.

(In addition to the above, see Cohen and Garet 1975 for a critical assessment of the accustomed manner in which applied research, particularly evaluation research, is viewed by consumers and researchers alike. They give figures on the increase in federal spending on evaluation of educational programs - evaluation following the government's venture into educational programming. For a general description of evaluation in federal agencies, see Wholey, et al. 1970. Pettigrew 1972 provides an example of policy decisions based on research.)

IV. EXTENT AND CAUSES OF EDUCATIONAL INEQUALITY

Since the 1930's, psychologists have postulated that the social stigma attached to being black produced a negative self-concept. Clark and Clark (1950), for example, demonstrated that both black and white children preferred white dolls over black dolls and associated more positive character traits with white dolls. In the 1954 Supreme Court decision, Clark's research was cited in support of the argument that segregated schools are inherently unequal. Schools segregated by force of law stigmatize those who are restricted to certain schools.

Since the Brown decision, the conceptualization of the consequences of segregation and of equal education opportunity have undergone a number of re-definitions. This section is arranged to reflect the sequence of development of different emphases in research and educational thinking.

IV. 1. Color Isolation in Schools

Initially segregation, or the stigmatizing purposive separation of black children from whites, was considered to constitute a lack of unequal education opportunity for black children. Segregation was translated into a judicially manageable and sociologically measurable concept by defining it as color isolation or the physical separation of black and white children in different schools. The nuance of stigmatization in some sense was lost and color isolation became a research focus.

A large amount of material describing the extent of color isolation in U. S. schools exists. Much of this material might be placed in the category of "progress reports" or evaluations of the degree of desegregation which has (not) occurred in the public schools in a particular area. (For examples see Clark 1962; Alexander 1963; Gibson, et al. 1963; Rose 1964; Walker, et al. 1967; Alabama Council on Human Relations 1972; Clark 1972a,b; and Hope 1975.)

The most comprehensive documentation of isolation was undertaken by a team headed by James Coleman. The nationwide survey was mandated by the 1964 Civil Rights Act, apparently to document the lack of availability of equal educational opportunity. The project, the second largest social science project in history, involved the testing of over half a million individuals and the gathering of data from some 4,000 schools. The report, the Equality of Educational Opportunity Report, commonly known as the Coleman Report, was submitted to Congress in 1966. (See Coleman, et al. 1966 and Mosteller and Moynihan 1972.)

The Coleman report revealed that most American school children were in schools where children of their own color constituted a large proportion of the student body. Eighty percent of all first grade white students, for example, were in such schools while sixty-five per cent of all first grade black students were in such schools.

A second large report, Racial Isolation in the Public Schools, was conducted by the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights (1967b), its mandate being to focus upon segregation resulting from circumstances other than legal compulsion. Within this constraint, primary attention was given to the cities and metropolitan areas. The findings of this study were that national and regional averages underestimated school segregation in the metropolitan areas where two-thirds of the black and two-thirds of the white population then lived. On the basis of their study the researchers concluded that color isolation in city schools is intense regardless of the size of the city and whether it is located in the North or South. Secondly, they concluded that the problem is increasing. Demographic trends beginning some sixty years ago had resulted in an increasing concentration of black people in the central cities with whites more heavily populating the suburban rings around the cities. These trends were associated by the authors of the report with the patterns of isolation found in the schools:

> The rich variety of the Nation's urban population is being separated into distinct groups, living increasingly in isolation from each other. In metropolitan areas there is a growing separation between the poor and the affluent, between the well educated and the poorly educated, between Negroes and whites. The racial, economic, and social stratification of cities and suburbs is reflected in similar stratification in city and suburban school districts. (1967b:17)

It is a general consensus that residential segregation in urban areas impedes school integration. This segregation occurs within the central city as well as between cities and their suburbs. Coleman (1975), on the basis of data on trends in school segregation between 1968-1973, suggests that while intra- or within-district segregation has decreased, inter- or between-district segregation has increased. The increase in between-district segregation is associated with white migration to the suburbs, a trend originally labeled "white flight" because it was believed to be associated with desegregation. The extent to which "white flight" is a result of school desegregation is a current source of research and debate. Given the current dominant perspective regarding school desegregation (that the presence of whites is essential to attainment of positive gains for blacks), the trend of white flight has important implications for policy formation.

(The debate over the causes of white flight has been stimulated by Coleman, et al.'s n.d. report on trends in school segregation, 1968-1973. Coleman attributes white flight to school desegregation especially where blacks constitute a large proportion of the population. His argument is contested in Green and Pettigrew 1976 and Farley 1976. See also Rist and Orfield 1976 and Coleman 1976. See Section V.2.e for further discussion of this topic.)

IV. 2. School Facilities

Underlying the conviction that segregated black students were systematically denied equal education opportunity was the assumption that black schools had poorer facilities than white schools. Black schools were imagined to be over-crowded, dilapidated, as having shorter terms, fewer textbooks, fewer and less qualified teachers, fewer courses, and so forth. The implicit belief held by some was that these restricted facilities could account for black-white differences in education. Perhaps as a result of the use of the courts as the vehicle of change, the notion of facilities was translated into per pupil expenditure. The expectation of differences in facilities, then, especially as they applied to the Southern schools, was that blacks were provided with inferior schools as measured by funds allocated.

These assumptions were strongly challenged by an important piece of government-sponsored research designed and reported upon by Coleman, et al. (1966). The Coleman study was a nationwide survey of segregated and desegregated school facilities and student achievement. The data from the survey have been analyzed and reanalyzed by groups such as that formed at Harvard and funded by the Carnegie Corporation (Mosteller and Moynihan 1972). The data has had a major impact on conceptualizations of desegregation and educational inequality.

The purpose of the survey was only vaguely described in the 1964 Civil Rights Act. The objectives which eventually evolved were: 1) to provide a description of differences in educational outcomes for six different groups (including black and white students), 2) to describe the resource inputs for six different groups, and 3) to examine the effects of various inputs on achievement.

The findings of the study did support the existence of differences between blacks and whites in educational outcomes. They did not, however, support the belief that there were marked differences between blacks and whites in terms of school facilities. In the various regions of the country, the level of school facilities of the black versus the white students were found to be roughly equivalent.* The physical facilities, the formal curricula, and most of the measurable characteristics of teachers in black and white schools were similar.

Secondly, the findings were strongly counter to received wisdom in that when family and peer group characteristics were held constant school facilities explained relatively little of the differences in achievement. Contrary to popular impression, differences between black and white schools' physical facilities, formal curricula, and teacher characteristics (as they were measured in the study) were very small. The small differences that did exist between schools did not relate to the achievement of students in the school. Differences were in the directions expected, but the amount of difference explained was practically negligible.

---

*There were differences between regions with the South having less adequate facilities in general than other regions. At that time, half of the black population was located in the South.

The Coleman study has been subjected to intense criticisms as might be expected of a study of such magnitude and importance. The criticisms which have been given most attention were primarily from researchers critical of the research methods. The criticisms of the Coleman study have been placed into four categories by the editors of a Harvard Educational Review (1969) issue which was devoted to further analysis and discussion of the EEO data:

(1) Alleged flaws in the design of the study (for example, a weak set of attitude questions).

(2) Difficulties in the execution of the survey which may have affected the results (for example, the refusal of a substantial number of school systems to cooperate).

(3) Alleged shortcomings in the analysis of the data (for example, the decision to control for the child's social class before examining the influence of the school on his achievement).

(4) Limitations of a survey taken at one point in time as a basis for forecasting the sustained effects of the changes in the educational system (for example, the effect of school integration).

(See Moynihan 1969 for a description of reactions to the Coleman report from the "research, education, and reform establishments.")

The general impact of the Coleman study with regard to school facilities seems to have shifted attention away from facilities as an explanation of differences between black and white educational outcomes and toward examination of non-school factors to explain these differences. Arguments as to the necessity for equal facilities, however, have continued. The present controversy concerning lack of equal financing among districts due to differences in wealth of the districts is one example. (See Section III.1.d.)

(There are numerous articles analyzing the Coleman report. Two sources are Harvard Educational Review 1969 and Mosteller and Moynihan 1972, the later produced by the group at Harvard funded to reanalyze the data. There have been further reanalyses directed to some of the same and different questions. The U. S. Commission on Civil Rights' 1967b study was based in part upon these data as was the Jencks, et al. 1972 volume.)

IV. 3. Explanations of Unequal Educational Outcomes.

The Coleman survey may be regarded as a watershed in conceptualizations of unequal education opportunity. The research directed explicit attention to both pupil and school input as well as outcomes and their interrelationships. Previously, it was implicitly assumed that the factors affecting educational outcomes were understood and that these included school facilities and resources. When the Coleman report undercut this assumption, the point of focus in conceptualization of equal education opportunity shifted toward outcomes. Equal educational opportunity came to be associated with equal outcomes rather than equal inputs.

The Coleman study had further implications. One of the basic explanatory mechanisms connecting segregation and unequal educational outcomes, that of inferior facilities, was weakened by the Coleman study. According to the manner in which it was interpreted, the Coleman study was taken to mean that differences in schools could not account for black-white differences in performance on standardized tests. This notion that school did not have any effect on these differences spurred on those who would explain the gap in other ways.

In the survey, equality of educational opportunity was measured in terms of school inputs, including racial composition. In analyzing the effect of racial composition upon educational achievement, Coleman found that minority students in majority-white desegregated schools did somewhat better than those in non-majority-white schools, but that the difference was not large. His findings were considered, however, as indicating the importance of the social class of the student body. These findings were interpreted by Moynihan (1969:30) for example as follows:

> His report has been correctly interpreted to be the most powerful social science case for school integration that has ever been made.

According to the thinking derived, children profited from being around peers of middle- or upper-income. Since black children are inordinately lower-income, then it follows that desegregation would be beneficial to them because color desegregation would mean class desegregation. Coleman's summary of his results (quoted in Mosteller and Moynihan 1972:20, italics Coleman's) are as follows:

> Altogether, the sources of inequality of educational opportunity appear to lie first in the home itself and the cultural influences immediately surrounding the home; then they lie in the schools' ineffectiveness to free achievement from the impact of the home, and in the schools' cultural homogeneity which perpetuates the social influences of the home and its environs.

This perspective was compatible with an emphasis that reached its peak in the 1960's on family background as a way to explain educational outcomes. Discussed under the label of "cultural deprivation", this idea achieved a considerable degree of support.

Arguing by analogy from studies of children who had very little adult stimulation such as those locked in attics or housed in understaffed orphanages, the theory arose that lower-income children did not get proper adult stimulation during periods of conceptual and verbal development. Research contrasting lower-income living conditions and parenting styles with idealized middle- and upper-income conditions and styles found the former lacking. The federal funds made available through the 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act were used to fund the development of programs to conteract this deprivation for disadvantaged students. Because many black children are products of lower-income backgrounds, the "disadvantaged" child was often thought of as a black child. To some degree, compensatory education, the rubric under which counters to deprivation came to be placed, was seen as an alternative to desegregation. If compensatory education took care of the gap between whites and blacks in educational outcomes, then why desegregate?

The cultural deprivation perspective was opposed by a number of reform-minded educators and social scientists, particularly anthropologists, who objected to the basic concept of cultural deprivation, arguing that cultural differences were being misinterpreted as cultural deficits. These arguments are similar to objections to the use of standardized tests with minority students on the grounds that they do not measure what the child has learned from his life experiences and are thus biased assessments of his ability. There have also been attempts at altering educational programs so as to make them more appropriate for the multi-cultural nature of the U. S. population. However, these programs, developed by educators, have not received the same widespread national attention as have the findings of Coleman, et al. (1966) and Jencks, et al. (1972).

Along with the emphasis on family and social class background as variables explaining differences in educational achievement, there was also a revival of interest in genetic explanations of group differences. The major researcher arguing this position is Jensen (1969).

The outcomes of desegregation began to be researched in earnest with regard to its effects upon educational variables (see Section VI). In a sense, however, the theoretical basis or conceptual foundation had been undercut. A number of alternative conceptualizations such as culture conflict, deprivation, and genetic inferiority - with uncertain theoretical relationships to desegregation - arose in the place of what had been a consensus in which segregation constituted the major obstacle preventing access to equal educational opportunities for blacks.

IV. 3.a. Cultural and Social Deprivation

Deprivation has been used to refer to a variety of characteristics. Gordon and Wilkerson (1966) define deprivation as a complex of characteristics: low economic status, low social status, low educational achievement, tenuous or no employment, limited participation in community organizations, and limited ready potential for upward mobility. People considered to be handicapped by this depressed social and economic status have been referred to in the literature by terms such as culturally deprived, socioeconomically deprived, educationally disadvantaged, and the like. The large body of literature that exists on the disadvantaged was developed by researchers who broadly regarded the deprived as bearers of cultural attitudes and behaviors substandard to those dominant in the broader communities they inhabit.

The "theory" of cultural deprivation, which reached its peak of acceptance in the middle and late 1960's, was based on the belief that lower-income as opposed to middle- and upper-income children tended to be exposed to insufficient stimulation which stunted their cognitive and verbal development. The children of the socially and economically deprived, it was argued, come to school disadvantaged in that their parents' culture failed to provide them with the experiences that are "normal" to the majority of school children. Primarily because of this condition, minority children were thought to show disproportionately high rates of social maladjustment, behavioral disturbance, physical disability, mental subnormality, and particularly, academic retardation. The culturally deprived child was thought to be lacking in readiness, motivation, and a learning-oriented value system. Examples of research interpreted to support this orientation are numerous. Lessor, Fifer, and Clark (1965) and Fort, Watts, and Lessor (1969) found that children of various ethnic groups differed on tests of verbal ability, reasoning, and numerical and spacial conceptualization. They believed that a lack of visual and verbal stimuli and lack of attention from parents in low-income homes led to deficits in visual, auditory, linguistic, and mnemonic abilities (see, for example, C. Deutsch 1967). Jensen (1968) found that basic learning abilities correlated highly with IQ scores for middle-class but not for lower-class students, leading him to postulate that basic abilities coupled with environmental advantages encouraged the type of conceptual development which the school requires.

A great deal of the deprivation literature concerns language acquisition. It has been suggested that children from disadvantaged backgrounds, in comparison with middle-class children, are less verbally proficient. Bloom, Davis, and Hess (1965), Gordon and Wilkerson (1966), and Osser (1973) provide summaries of the research. An early study by Pringle, Kellmer, and Tanner (1958) found differences in quantitatively measured language functions which consistently indicated that children raised in their own homes were superior to children who were raised in institutions. Interpretation of these results suggested that children raised in conditions of inadequate exposure to language would fail to fully develop linguistically. Further studies looked at the relationship between economic group status and language development. (For an early example, see Irwin 1948.) These studies found that more children with what was considered retarded speech development were from lower socioeconomic groups than from upper classes. In a series of studies, Bernstein developed the hypothesis that the language of lower-class youth was characterized by a restricted form which confined their thinking. In contrast, upper-class youth tended to develop a more elaborative language which allowed greater freedom in communication (Bernstein 1961). For elaboration of these ideas, see M. Deutsch (1967b).

The concept of linguistic deprivation and associated research has been criticized by those who argue, for example, that the supporting research is severely biased because the researchers seem to lack awareness of the sociolinguistic factors affecting their results and to be ignorant of the fact that what they regard as linguistic errors are actually manifestations of rules used in alternative dialects of English. (See Labov 1970; Cazden, John, and Hymer 1972; Keddie 1973; and Cole and Scribner 1974.)

Other research has looked at how deprivation affects cognitive and social development of children (see, for example, Riessman 1962, Ausubel 1964, and Deutsch and Brown 1964). Rosen (1956) and Katz (1967), representing another line of research, looked at motivation among different social class groups.

Educational policies associated with, and resulting from the research in cultural deprivation were reflected in the general development of compensatory education programs which were primarily constructed to fulfill deficiencies in child backgrounds. While some later research has attempted to disprove or redefine basic assumptions of cultural deprivation, there has also been a growing body of criticisms of the appropriateness of compensatory education programs (Wolf and Wolf 1962, Baratz and Baratz 1970, D. Cohen 1972). (Further description of compensatory education is included in Section V. 5. c.)

(At a more global level, cultural and social deprivation theories have their counterpart in the concept of "culture of poverty." See Fuchs 1969, Leacock 1969, Harris 1975 for further references and critiques of these views as applied to minority groups in the United States.)

IV. 3.b. Genetic Inferiority

Following the Supreme Court's school desegregation decision in 1954, there was a revival of racist doctrines positing biologically based inferiority on the alleged genetic intellectual inferiority of blacks. Inferior educational outcomes for black children, the argument went, resulted from genes, not segregation.

What has been referred to as a "scientific racist" position was subsequently developed by several social scientists who looked at differences between performances on I.Q. tests by blacks versus whites (A. Coleman 1972). The bulk of this research found blacks lower in I.Q. than whites. Shuey's (1966) The Testing of Negro Intelligence represents the culmination of this type of research which concluded that the presence of some native differences between blacks and whites determined intelligence test results. These early studies assumed that intelligence was a fixed capacity which was distinguishable from educational achievement. This basic genetic difference was cited as one reason for the failure of the compensatory educational programs of the 1960's.

Pettigrew (1964) provides a good review of the early research on I.Q. and genetic racial differences. Davey (1973) reviews the later research, particularly focusing upon Jensen's views. Jensen (1969, 1973) remains the primary proponent of genetic differences between whites and blacks which have educational implications. Criticisms of the genetic inferiority position are numerous. For example, see Light and Smith (1969), and Brace, et al. 1971.

IV. 3.c. Biased Assessment and Negative Labeling

The cultural deprivationists tended to compare the parenting styles and community organization of lower-income people with idealized versions of middle- and upper-class styles. Linguistic characteristics and social behavior patterns of lower-income children similarly were assessed against patterns manifested by middle- and upper-income children. This dependence on a deficit view of minority patterns where divergences from middle-class norms were considered errors has decreased somewhat in the area of testing over the last few years. Primarily the arguments against standardized tests is that they are invalid with minority children owing to dissimilarities in experience. Standardized tests are normed on children whose experiences vary systematically from those of many black children; thus the content of questions and the types of testing situations, for example, tend to be inappropriate for minority children. (See Cole and Scribner 1974 for references on this subject including others by Cole and his associates. Early articles on biases in testing refer to the concept of "culture fair" tests. See Anatasi 1965. As others have argued and Cole's work demonstrates, this concept is not very meaningful.)

The biases in these tests have come under particular attack in situations where such tests are used in classification procedures. Jane Mercer's work has been important in this regard. She explored school and agency classification procedures for children based on standardized intelligence tests, and found that the procedures resulted in labeling as mentally retarded a disproportionately large number of Chicanos and blacks. She argued that current classification procedures violate the rights of children to be evaluated within a culturally appropriate normative framework, their right to be assessed as multi-dimensional beings, their right to be fully educated, their right to be free of stigmatizing labels, and their right to cultural identity and respect. (See Mercer 1974; see also Section VI. 1. a.)

Faulty assessment has also been linked to another explanation of poor performance by minority children. Research during the last ten years indicates that differing expectations of students are held by teachers and communicated perhaps unconsciously to the students. Development of thought and research in how teacher expectations influence student performance was originally stimulated by Rosenthal and Jacobson's 1968 study, Pygmalion in the Classroom. The basic assumption of their study was that one person's expectation for another's behavior could come to serve as a self-fulfilling prophecy. (1968:174) Carried out in a public elementary school in grades 1 through 6, this study tested the hypothesis by manipulating teachers' expectations for their students' achievement to see if those expectations would be fulfilled. The manipulation, and therefore the influence on teacher expectations, was created by claiming that a general achievement test had been developed to identify late intellectual "bloomers." Children were accordingly labeled on a random basis and the results given to the teachers. At the end of a year, achievement test data offered some evidence that the children labeled as late bloomers showed better performance than they had previously. The authors concluded that the results could be explained by the self-fulfilling prophecy effects of teacher expectations. They reasoned that the expectations created about these "special" children caused the teachers to somehow treat them differently, so that they really did do better by the end of the year.

The controversy which followed publication of this finding was given impetus by the serious implications of the findings that teachers might be responsible for maintaining different student performance levels. Even more seriously, since minority students frequently have been at a disadvantage in meeting mainstream cultural and academic standards because they had different cultural backgrounds, they were often placed in the "slow" category. Through time, a cycle of being so labeled and performing up to that label could form a basis for continued minority group existence since members of the group would not have the chance to enter mainstream culture.

The seriousness of Rosenthal and Jacobson's findings were, and are generally still considered convincing. Numerous replications, however, have not produced conclusive support for the argument, thus diminishing the potency of their results.

Thorndike (1968), White (1969), Brophy and Good (1970, 1974), Fleming and Anttonen (1971), all provide good reviews of this area of research. Finn (1972) both reviews this research and places it in the general context of other work in biased assessment.

IV. 3.d. Cultural Differences

There is a small body of literature addressed to the effects of school response to cultural and linguistic differences (not deficits) on educational inequality. Stimulated by a growing awareness of problems faced by ethnic, especially black, students in public schools, research in this area has focused on the compatibility between the cultural patterns learned at home and those required and expected at school. It is assumed that experience affects learning and that if frequent disjunctions between the student's reality and that reflected in the content taught at school occur, learning may be made more difficult than if the content was more closely matched to the learner's reality. Underlying basic differences between the child's home and school experiences would, in other words, be in conflict resulting in depressed academic achievement and poor performance in school. Some of the research here, for example, focuses on styles of behavior expected and rewarded in the students' home situation, comparing it with those expected and valued in school. For example, the black child may learn to undertake responsibility for his own care and that of younger siblings; however, the skills and value orientations which comprise this ability are disregarded in a school where the teacher regulates and often severely restricts inter-personal activities as a means of directing students' attention toward academic achievement. Other research compares learning styles and sociolinguistic patterns, finding in some cases that patterns expected in the school violate patterns expected at home. These areas of "cultural conflict", it is argued, lead to misinterpretations on the parts of both minority students and the teacher. (Many of these studies are the work of anthropologists, e.g., Fuchs 1969, Rosenfeld 1971, Valentine 1971, and Gallimore, et al. 1974. For a position paper in this area see Johnson 1973.)

The cultural difference model which explains lower educational outcomes of lower-income and minority children using the concept of culture conflict was criticized by Valentine (1971, 1972) who argued that cultural differences would become simply a euphemism for cultural deficits or deprivation and that educators would simply use it as a rationalization for failure to succeed with minority children. Valentine argued that most black Americans tend to be bicultural, that is, they are able to negotiate white mainstream institutions as well as black institutions. Valentine argues, thus, that black Americans as well as other minority groups are perfectly capable of learning alternative cultural patterns to use when the need arises. An emergent position is that culture conflict is not sufficient to produce poor achievement in school; it must also be accompanied by some form of continuing negative institutional response to cultural differences. Recently, Gallimore, et al. (1974), in a study of minority high school students, have added to the conceptualization by describing what they term a "culture of conflict". A culture of conflict is a pattern of interaction which arises in cases where teachers and students of different backgrounds negatively respond to one another so that patterns of behavior are developed which would not occur in either culture. Teachers treat children in a way they would never consider treating children of their own group and similarly students treat teachers in ways they would never treat adults in their own community.

V. REMEDIAL EFFORTS AND COUNTER FORCES IN IMPLEMENTATION

The major actors and events determining the course of school desegregation policy have not been local officials, educators, or parents involved in the schools on a day-to-day basis. These individuals, however, have borne the brunt of the responsibility for the implementation of desegregation. In many ways, the demands exceeded the ability of local systems to respond constructively to the changes required.

Initially, school desegregation was associated with a strong ideological focus on the egalitarian principles of American society. The ideological basis, however, did not overshadow the cultural basis for white resistance to desegregation in the South. (See Section II.1) As a result of strong local resistance to desegregation, the courts and federal agencies were forced to devise measurable standards by which to assess compliance. In the process of this translation, some of the ideological force motivating the changes was lost. Local officials were told to implement specific plans narrowly focused upon achieving a certain degree of mixture by social race. Not able to argue the plans on educational merits nor in terms of an ideological position acceptable to their constituents, the officials could only present the plans as directives from higher and not always valued government sources, which, if not implemented, would result in the loss of funds or the application of other sanctions. (See Strout and Sroufe 1968 who outline the dilemma faced by school administrators.)

In the short run, desegregation has tended to separate communities into pro- and anti-desegregation factions which exert a great deal of creative energy, not in devising constructive means of achieving desegregation, but in countering one another and the latest emergent government policy. Piece by piece, the many changes required in the process of adaptation of the school district and the schools have been developed on the local level in response to specific pressure from external sources of power rather than in accord with a perspective that is ideologically meaningful on the local level.

In the absence of a meaningful ideological basis, perhaps parents, both black and white who are dissatisfied and discouraged with the public schools have turned to alternatives associated with more coherent ideologies. White parents seeking to avoid desegregated schools have been responsible for the creation and expansion of alternative private schools emphasizing conservative values. Black parents, on the other hand, and some white parents (although for different reasons) have supported a movement to redistribute control over school decisions, emphasizing the role of the community in shaping its schools.

School desegregation on the local level, then, has tended to be a matter of reaction and adjustment to policy decisions forged at a higher level. The reactive nature of the local response is also reflected in educational developments which have come about in the wake of desegregation efforts. The various programs may be seen primarily as aimed at adjustments to the increased diversity of students now attending the same schools. In many cases, the emergent programs have merely been methods to allow the continuation of the status quo.

V.1. Methods of District Desegregation

Early methods of implementation of desegregation included "skillful districting", pupil placement, provisions for freedom of choice in school enrollment, some busing to disperse heavy concentrations of minority populations, pairing of schools to shift away from neighborhood schools, and implementation of the Pupil Assignment Act (Day, et al. 1963). These procedures, however, only slightly reduced school segregation and were not widely practiced, particularly in the South. Clark (1972a) in another review of earlier methods of implementing desegregation describes a number of "educational programs, plans, and gimmicks" offered in the 1960's to entice blacks to accept substitutes for serious and effective public school desegregation. Compensatory education and voucher programs are two plans he discusses.

There is a large body of literature on current school desegregation programs, most of which is descriptive. A summary of current implementation plans is provided by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights (1961, 1967a) and Brain (1963). Most of the other references describe desegregation practices in particular schools and school districts, such as that of Henderick (1968) which is a detailed history and current description of the Riverside, California, desegregation plan. Turner (1962) provides a similar report for New York City. Many of these studies evaluate procedures used to obtain racial balance in schools, as well as describe the current conditions in school systems. Camp, et al. (1969), for example, describes the Portland, Oregon, "Suburban Transfer Program". These descriptive studies vary in detail and comprehensiveness. In the following sections of this outline, desegregation techniques implemented in some of these areas are further detailed.

A great deal of the energy devoted to implementing school desegregation in many districts has involved devising plans whereby the degree of mixing required by the courts or HEW will be realized. The types of remedy which have become prominent at different periods represent the increasing demand of the courts for massive as opposed to token desegregation and the shift of judicial attention from rural Southern districts to urban districts including those in the North and the West.

(Aside from the descriptive material mentioned above there are also some sources which were intended to serve as guides to desegregation implementation. Suchman, et al. 1958 is such a reference as is Wey and Corey 1959. Representing newer works of this sort is Ornstein's 1974 analysis. This book outlines organizational approaches for distributing decision-making authority and power in the community for school desegregation, especially in metropolitan areas.)

V. 1.a. Open Enrollment and Freedom of Choice

Early attempts during the 1950's to desegregate the schools were often circumvented by laws and state constitutional amendments which had the effect of actually delaying the desegregation process. The most common device was pupil assignment laws which gave local schools the power to establish criteria for assigning students to schools. By manipulating the various requirements, local officials were able to preserve segregation (Orfield, 1969b:18).

Open enrollment and freedom of choice plans were methods of desegregation developed in the 1960's. Under these plans, no student was forced to transfer out of his neighborhood or local school to another, but individual students were given the opportunity to make transfers (both within and sometimes outside their district lines) if they wished to do so. The courts were not impressed with the results of such plans although it is possible to see both hypothetical advantages and disadvantages. Mizel (1968), for example, presents two views. The first view is favorable, but notes that much more time is needed for freedom of choice to start operating effectively. Unlike quota transfer plans, open enrollment plans do not deny black (or white) parents their democratic right to choose a school. The other view argues against open enrollment plans on the basis that general psychological and social restraints make the black's freedom to choose more theoretical than real. For example, Orfield (1969b:137), mentions a study by the Office of Education which identified twenty-five practical difficulties of free choice. One such difficulty concerned the method of making application forms for freedom of choice available to black parents. Usually these forms were given to the children to take home to be filled out. However, in some cases, black teachers were pressured by school officials to mark black students' choices for primarily black schools; parents were often afraid to take back to the school principal a request to transfer a child to a white school. (Also see Crockett 1957; Weinstein and Geisel 1962; Day, *et al*. 1963; and Binderman 1972.)

There is a general consensus in the literature that open enrollment and freedom of choice plans are not a successful approach to school desegregation (Saint Louis Board of Education 1969; Binderman 1972; and McAdams 1974). Later, attempts were made to make freedom of choice workable, using such things as assurances from the courts and school officials that guidelines directing school superintendents to assign free choice students to the nearest school with available space would be enforced. Compliance with these guidelines became an administrative nightmare and provoked considerable local opposition (Orfield 1969b:138).

V. 1.b. Rezoning

Especially in smaller cities or areas which have relatively small sections of high density black populations, desegregation has been achieved by some of the same methods originally used to preserve segregation, such as strategic site selection for schools. Other frequently used methods have included changing and enlarging the attendance areas of school districts.

Pairing, one such device, involves merging the attendance areas of two or more schools serving the same area. The concept was introduced in 1948 in Princeton, New Jersey, where two elementary school student populations were merged; students in grades K-5 were assigened to one school and students in grades 6-8, to the other. Swanson (1965) presents a detailed report of the introduction of the "Princeton Plan" in New York City, with special emphasis on resulting political ramifications.

In some cases where schools have been ordered to achieve racial balance contiguous attendance areas have been impossible given residential segregation. In these cases, satelliting may be used where a quota of students are sent to a school in an area not contiguous with their own.

In communities which have a larger number of schools, "central schools" have been established. This is essentially an extended form of pairing, where a whole district is made a single attendance zone and all students in one or two grades are placed in a single large school. Englewood, N.J., Berkeley, Cal., and Teaneck, N.J. all implemented this type of program to accomplish desegregation. A related idea is that of "educational parks." Several desegregated schools, serving a total student population of 5,000 to 30,000, would be grouped together to allow efficient use of staff and resources, provide a wide range of administrative and auxiliary services, and offer expanded educational opportunities beyond the financial capabilities of the smaller schools. A number of educational advantages to such parks have been discussed. (See Fischer 1967 and Keppel 1967.) With regard to desegregation, educational parks, by combining smaller schools, would have the effect of substituting desegregated parks for segregated neighborhood schools.

(A general report by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights on racial isolation 1967b provides brief descriptions of several educational park proposals in East Orange, N.J., New York City, Berkeley, Cal., Pittsburg, Pa., and Albuquerque, N.M. as well as some discussion of the advantages of this plan. This reference also includes a comprehensive bibliography. A number of papers which further evaluate the potential of educational parks are combined in a special report by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights 1967a.)

V. 1.c. Busing

In large urban districts where residential segregation is extreme, it is often impossible to obtain any degree of mixing without transporting some children out of their neighborhoods to other schools. With court pressure on urban areas such as Boston and Detroit to desegregate, the means of transportation, buses, have acquired an ascendancy in the 1970's as a symbol of desegregation. In the Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education decision of 1971, the Supreme Court upheld the constitutionality of busing as one means by which a dual school system could be dismantled. The court cautioned, however, that the decision did not apply to using busing in de facto segregation based on neighborhood patterns and that when busing was employed, time and distance of busing should be carefully considered as well as the age of students to be bused. Despite these assurances, busing has become an emotional, political, and social symbol for many favoring neighborhood schools (Hermalin and Farley, 1973). This is reflected by the massive, growing amount of literature concerning busing.

Mills (1973) presents one of the most comprehensive reviews of the busing issue in an edited collection which includes important articles on the background and legal history of busing, the debate on the effectiveness and implications of busing, and several case studies of particular busing plans. Also see Durham (1973), Rist (1974a) Mathews (1975) and Orfield (1975) for overviews of the busing issue.

The primary points of discussion in busing are its effectiveness in achieving equal education opportunity for black children and its ultimate social cost in terms of neighborhood disruption. In a detailed article, Armor (1972a) concludes that busing does not lead to improved grades, aspirations, and attitudes for black children. Pettigrew, et al. (1973) in an extensive reply to Armor and other opponents of mandatory busing, point out that, although the evidence is incomplete, busing does achieve legal desegregation and desegregated schools may improve the academic performance of black pupils and lead to increased college enrollment for black students (see Section VI for a more detailed discussion of these questions). Popular objections to busing tend to focus upon the element of being "forced" to send children to a particular school and the prospect of loss of neighborhood unity through the loss of neighborhood schools which serve as a force in preserving neighborhood traditions.

Busing is obviously just one factor in the complex issue of school desegregation. Although there is a great deal of discussion about busing, some suggest that busing is actually a phony issue. (See Askew, 1972 and Durham, 1973.) Harvey and Holmes (1972) and Green, et al. (1972) stress this point as well, indicating that the busing controversy is being used as an excuse to avoid facing the real issues, the development of a pluralistic society. Others, such as the NAACP Legal Defense Fund, have put what they consider the real issue underlying the busing controversy in more direct terms. One of their 1973 articles is entitled, "It's Not the Busing, It's the Niggers."

V. 1.d. Multi-district Desegregation

Coleman (1975) in some of his latest analyses of trends in school desegregation, points out that although segregation within districts has to some extent been alleviated, segregation between districts has accelerated. This pattern results in part from the demographic trends of black settlement in the inner cities with white migration to the suburban areas. For a number of reasons, the question of the meaningfulness of desegregating districts which are mostly black has been raised. This has focused attention upon the issue of metropolitan desegregation or desegregation across the school district lines which subdivide metropolitan areas.

The most important court cases of the 1970's have concerned issues in urban desegregation one of which is metropolitan desegregation. The 1974 Milliken v. Bradley Supreme Court decision included this issue. In that case, the judges did not require desegregation across district lines, but the ultimate position of the courts is not yet clear. (See Section III.1.c.)

Popular support for multi-district desegregation is not high. As Gittell (1976) points out, consolidation of school districts has been a strong trend in the last twenty-five years. Contrary to these trends, however, consolidation of metropolitan districts has been a different history. State laws have been passed to allow more local input on consolidation decisions with the results that many referendums are turned down by local votes. Spokespeople against metropolitan desegregation have also at times included black leaders who argue that black control of city districts will be lost.

On the other hand, the push toward metropolitan desegregation is occurring at the same time as a push toward metropolitanization of services in general. There have been a number of educators for example, who have advocated the metropolitanization of educational services for a variety of reasons. Battle (1973), for example, advocates cooperative arrangements between city and suburban school districts which can potentially break down current financial and ethnic boundaries between the city and suburb. With this plan, the financial base of the school system, the property area, is broader and more equally shared between schools. As another example, Levine (1973) further describes the advantages and disadvantages of the approach.

(For a detailed analysis of possible patterns of the implementation of metropolitan schools, see Ornstein 1974. For overviews of other problems in metropolitanization, see Scott 1972 and Glazer 1974. Also see Section V.3. on community control, a traditional pattern of school control that metropolitanization counters.)

V. 2. Community and Individual Resistance

Community-level resistance to desegregation has been provoked by the spread of beliefs, some grounded in fact and others not, about the harmful effects of desegregation on white school children. White parents have expressed fear and anxiety about sending their children to schools in certain neighborhoods; they have balked at the idea of their children attending lower status schools. They have complained about the breakup of friendship groups, the distance traveled to get to school, and the denial of their "rights' to live in a certain neighborhood and benefit from its schools. Other more extremist groups have resisted desegregation on the grounds that interracial contact will lead to interracial marriage and the eventual degradation of the white race.

Belief in the validity of these concerns has spawned public, sometimes violent, demonstrations, harrassment of black families, a large increase in the number of private schools dedicated to segregation, and movement by white middle- and upper-income families to suburban school districts - all of which have succeeded in slowing the forward momentum of the desegregation process.

V. 2.a. Demonstrations, Protests, Harassment

Local resistance to school desegregation has included various forms of protests, demonstrations, and acts of violence against potential desegregators. School boycotts, picket lines, and protest marches which sometimes result in riots, assaults, and the destruction of hated symbols of desegregation such as school buses continue to be expressions of community resistance.

Local resistance to school desegregation has also included more seemingly premeditated forms of violence which in some cases have resulted in the loss of life. Acts of terrorism to prevent black children from attending white schools were undertaken by unorganized white resisters and groups such as the Ku Klux Klan, a secret society which experienced a revival when segregated institutions began to come under serious threat from civil rights activity in the early 1960's.

Materials on these methods of resistance to desegregation tend to be incorporated in general accounts of early desegregation in the South (e.g., Orfield 1969b) or in the general accounts of the civil rights movement in the 1950's and 1960's. Accounts written for general audiences also exist. Coles' (1967) account of the experiences of black children in the Deep South during the early period of desegregation is probably the best known. It includes sections describing and analyzing the various forms of harassment encountered by black children and their families. (For other examples, see Braden's 1958 description of community resistance to residential desegregation in Louisville in the early 1950's. Chesler 1967 includes verbatim accounts of the experiences of early black school desegregators.)

Some research is also avilable concerning the role of community groups in desegregation implementation and the factors related to the degree of resistance which develops. An early study by Vander Zanden (1958) looked particularly at the kinds of resistance and the conditions under which it occurred. He proposed a number of generalizations and hypotheses including the following: 1) the exploitation of racial and desegregation issues for political purposes tends to be associated with an increase in resistance: 2) disagreement, competition, or conflict between levels or agencies of government over the policy or procedure to be pursued toward desegregation tends to intensify mass resistance; and 3) the prevalent "educative programs" designed to facilitate adult acceptance of desegregation, which operate through parent-teacher associations and civic groups, has tended to be at best a minor factor determing the incidence or severity of disturbances attendant upon desegregation.

Some of Vander Zanden's generalizations have been supported in later work. Kirby, et al. (1973) investigated the school desegregation issue in ninety-one Northern and Western cities between 1963 and 1969. The study investigated such questions as the identity of power holders in decision-making, participants in desegregation-related decisions, and factors affecting conflict. The conclusions drawn were that the most important actors in desegregation were the civic elite, including mayors, businessmen, and school superintendents; the desegregation issue was not settled in the streets and white citizen groups opposed to desegregation were rather ineffective as were pro-desegregation groups. Reporting the findings of the study with regard to community unrest, Kirby and Crain (1974) draw the conclusions that cities with militant black populations and school boards with a high level of internal conflict are more likely to have desegregation-related disturbances. Further information along these lines is included in Crain (1968).

(See also, Dentler's 1965 article which looks at the various elements of community organization which influence desegregation, whether by impeding or facilitating action on the issue. Also see Killian and Grigg 1965 and Rogers 1967 for other general evaluations and descriptions of community disturbance patterns.

V. 2.b. Private Schools

Partially following the Supreme Court's 1954 decision and the 1964 Civil Rights Act, there has been a rapid increase in the number of private schools, especially in the South (Leeson 1966,1967; Palmer 1971). In Mississippi, for example, between 1964 and 1971, the number of private schools jumped from under twenty to two hundred thirty-six. Many of these private schools which appear to have been started primarily as acts of resistance to desegregation have now become known as "segregation academies" by their detractors.

Some of the early efforts to avoid desegregation involved an attempt to create state-supported segregated private schools. The methods used whereby extensive state grants and loans were made to private schools or tuition grants were made to students who could then choose private schools were later declared illegal. (See Section III.1.f.) Although lacking state support, such private schools continue to exist, sometimes with the assistance of voluntary organizations such as churches which sponsor such schools.

(At this point, there is only a limited amount of literature concerning the private school movement. There are two articles, however, that do emphasize the growing importance of private schools in relation to desegregation. One by Brown and Provizer 1972 is a case study of two segregation academies in a county in Georgia. The other, by Terjon 1972, presents an overview of the role of segregated private schools and some initial data on the number of such institutions.)

V. 2.c. White Flight

There are a number of references which deal with the relationship between school desegregation and population movements in and out of school attendance areas (Pettigrew and Cramer 1959; Farley 1976; Orfield 1976). In some cases, this type of population movement ultimately leads to what has been called resegregation or the re-establishment of segregated patterns. A term that has become associated with certain types of population movement, "white flight", refers to what was originally believed to be a white response to desegregation. Leacock *et al.* (1959), for example, defined white flight as "panic moving" where there was a quick sale and turnover of housing from whites to blacks. This movement was primarily thought to be initiated by desegregation.

Reporting the major findings of his larger work, *Trends in School Segregation, 1968-1973* (Coleman, *et al.* n.d.), Coleman (1975) suggests that desegregation of central city schools has accelerated the process of residential segregation between the city and the suburbs by increasing the extent of white flight. Where school district boundaries are basically coterminious with city-county municipal units, such residential segregation is reflected in school enrollment figures. Coleman finds that the patterns of mass exodus have occurred during the year of school desegregation in a number of cities, especially in the larger cities where there is a higher proportion of black students. Green and Pettigrew (1976) are highly critical of Coleman's research methodology which, they claim, has biased his results. Other articles by Mumford (1973), Farley (1976), Orfield (1976), and Rist and Orfield (1976) substantiate Green and Pettigrew's claim and look more closely at the nature of white flight, particularly questioning whether white flight is initiated and supported by forced school desegregation, or is primarily an independent occurrence which results from: (1) a general trend toward declining enrollments primarily in cities but also in many suburbs, (2) the pattern of white out-migration from cities which developed primarily as a result of lack of housing long before the school desegregation issue was a dominant social pressure, or (3) special local circumstances which occur simultaneously with desegregation, such as the closing of an industry. Regardless of its causes, whether they be social, economic or political, white flight is seen as an important issue to deal with in educational planning (Rist and Orfield 1976). As described above, the presence of an ample number of whites in a desegregating district has achieved the position of a high priority concern for some who argue that whites are necessary both in terms of financial resources and their effect on black achievement scores. (See Section IV.)

V. 3. Community Control and Decentralization

Issues of decentralization and community control became increasingly important in the mid 1960's. Although the two issues derive from different perspectives, they both seem to have gained momentum as a result of court-ordered desegregation.

Proponents of decentralization are most often white parents who feel that their control of schools has been usurped by large bureaucratic bodies which are more responsive, especially with regard to desegregation, to the demand of federal officials than to local citizens. This group advocates the dissolution of the massive bureaucracies and the return of control to local units. The neighborhood school symbolizes the decentralization issue. Although it is conceded that such schools do promote a closer school-community bond, they have been attacked on the grounds that they maintain de facto segregation. (See Fischer 1964, Dodson 1965, Burt and Alexander 1969, and Somerville 1969.) Since the neighborhood school concept is counter to current trends in desegregation, especially multi-district desegregation, a great deal of conflict has been generated at the community level by proponents of this approach.

Community control, on the other hand, tends to be a position espoused by blacks frustrated by the slow pace of desegregation and the failure of expected positive outcomes for their children. For blacks who have come to believe that present school systems are fundamentally racist in their social and cultural organization, community control is seen as a means of transferring control of schools to black groups who will be more responsive to the needs of black children. Other blacks have focused on the ecuational importance of control. They are concerned with the negative psychological consequences for blacks of lack of control over important institutions which affect their lives.

They cite Coleman et al.'s (1966) finding that increases in black children's sense of control over their environment promotes higher academic achievement as evidence of the need for black control of schools. With community control, the focus of the black perspective on education opportunities shifts from improved achievement to improved self-respect as a means of stimulating achievement gains.

(For more information on these topics, see Altschuler 1970 for a discussion of community control, Kirp 1970 for discussion of the legality of community control, and D. Cohen 1969 for information on both decentralization and community control as well as a discussion of the general confusion produced by conflicting research results which question whether either approach to school reorganization will produce more positive educational outcomes.)

V. 4. The Role of School Personnel in District Desegregation

Administrators, school board members, principals, and teachers often fear the implementation of desegregation because it is disruptive. It often requires complicated attendance plans, student and teacher transfers as well as provisions and facilities for new students in a school. Although these participants in the desegregation process could provide a strong voice of support which might calm parental fears about and promote a smooth transition to desegregated schools, they have usually not done so. Political reasons for this failure are discussed in the two subsections which follow.

Teacher organizations have also been relatively inactive in desegregation although some have come to the aid of black teachers who tended to be displaced when desegregation occurred.

V. 4.a. School Boards and Administrators

Local school boards have been involved in desegregation struggles for a long period of time. During the 1950's, school boards tired to forestall the desegregation forces by upgrading black schools. Later, local boards in other areas affected by increasing residential segregation also made attempts to avert the court's attention by developing plans for some desegregation of schools. (See, for example, Stout and Sroufe 1968.)

Many have argued that local school boards have little real power as a result of the increased politicalization of education which, in many cases, has placed the educational decision-making process in the hands of state legislators. Also, the consolidation of school districts, which limits parental access and increases bureaucracy, and the erosion of administrative control of classroom activities in the face of increased teacher militancy have been cited as further reasons for loss of local administrative power. (See, for example, Goodman 1968 and Guthrie and Skene 1973.) This lack of power seems to have been further accentuated by the threat of desegregation. Desegregation is disruptive to school officials because it undermines the power base from which they operate. School superintendents, who normally have some control over educational policy have no power to prevent court-ordered desegregations. Superintendents also have no educational basis for advocating desegregation since the research findings on academic outcomes are inconclusive. At the same time, traditional backers of the school board (those most actively involved and those who provide the schools' financial base), most often white middle-income parents, are often opposed to or at least divided over the issue of desegregated schools. At the same time the board, entrusted with the task of implementing desegregation at the district level, faces counter pressures from other local interests. Groups, including civil rights groups, who favor desegregation may also represent a new community force with which the school board must contend. This withdrawal of traditional support, coupled with the confrontation with new interest groups, is seen as a difficulty which may prevent the board from taking any decisive action, thus increasing the possibility of conflict.

One proposed solution to the board's dilemma has been to set up citizen advisory committees and hold public meetings to symbolize community participation and legitimization of decisions on desegregation implementation. It has been suggested, however, that such groups are effective only when they include individuals who are influential in the community.

(For an interesting case study of one school board's attempt to develop a provisional desegregation plan, see Stout and Sroufe 1968; for the effect of school board dissention on conflict over desegregation, se Vander Zanden 1958; Kirby and Crain 1974; for the influence of community leaders on local desegregation, see King and Mayer 1972, and Kirby and Crain 1974.)

V. 4.b. Teachers

Soon after the 1964 Civil Rights Act ordered large-scale and immediate desegregation of public schools, it became apparent that faculty desegregation would not proceed at the same rate as desegregation of student bodies. An immediate consequence of desegregation was a reduction in the number of black teachers and administrators. Typically, whenever black students were transfered to white schools, black teachers were dismissed or transfered to crowded black schools. When whole schools were closed (which most frequently happened to black schools ostensibly because their facilities were not as good as those in white schools), teachers, principals, and other staff members were often left without jobs. In some states school districts changed certification policies, failed to renew contracts, and harassed teachers who were black or who advocated civil rights. This practice enabled the districts to hire more conservative white teachers. In other places, black teachers were assigned to desegregated schools in some "special" capacity, such as black student counselor or special education teacher, which kept them isolated from contact with most of the predominantly white students. These tactics also reduced job opportunities for black graduates in education. (For more information, see National Commission on Professional Rights and Responsibilities of the National Education Association 1965, Ozmon 1965, and Egerton 1967.)

Since 1970, more strict policies for teacher assignments have been established at the insistence of black leaders and the National Education Association. Although it is scanty, some research now exists which indicates the positive effects that black teachers, principals, and other staff members can have in desegregated schools. For information on the positive outcomes of black teachers and staff as role models for black children, see Lamanna 1965; for positive effects on black achievement scores, see Spady 1973; for positive effects on educational attainment, see Darkenwald 1975; for the effect on reducing violence and discipline, see Pettigrew 1975.

There is some literature concerned with the role of teacher organizations in desegregation. One article by Myers (1966) suggests that the American Federation of Teachers (AFT), through its locals, can play a valuable role in desegregation if its members recognize that desegregation is a part of a larger school reform and educational improvement movement. However, a look at the literature on teacher groups suggests they have taken a limited and sometimes negative stand on school desegregation.

Groff (1962) and Dewing (1968) present overviews of AFT and NEA (National Education Association) policy regarding school desegregation since the 1930's. They suggest that because of their size and collective nature, these organizations are often forced to take a moderate position with regard to controversial issues like desegregation. On the other hand, as early as 1954 NEA was involved in protecting the rights of black teachers who lost their jobs as a consequence of desegregation. Initially NEA provided counseling and advice as well as limited financial assistance to displaced teachers.

In 1965 they organized a drive to raise one million dollars to help with legal fees made necessary by school administrative attempts to block the hiring and rehiring of black teachers in newly desegregated districts. (See Commission on Professional Rights and Responsibilities of the National Education Association 1965.)

One reference notes specifically how a local teacher organization can affect segregation. Sobel (1973:2) cites an incident where teachers blocked the implementation of a research program which would have substantially increased documentary evidence of the value of integrated education: "They did so because they were fearful that the project might reveal racism among some of the teaching staff and possibly lead to dismissal, loss of tenure, community favor, or something similar. Sobel also suggests that the developing pattern of teacher organization and teacher militancy may be linked to white resistance to social race mixing, representing one of the more covert deterrents to desegregation which runs through society.

V. 5. Educational Programs and Practices Related to Desegregation

Relative to the elaborate preparation that went into designing busing plans and redrawing district lines to achieve desegregated schools, changes in the educational system itself as a result of desegregation have been slight. A number of reasons have been suggested for this. Limitations on the school's ability to change may stem from lack of community committment to desegregation which results in refusals to vote bond issues to finance programs for meeting the individual needs of new students in the schools (M. Deutsch 1967a) as well as from resistance by school personnel to innovations which threaten existing and familiar patterns of the social organization of the school, such as means of controlling and grouping pupils and status relationships among staff members (Willover, *et al.* 1973, Baratz 1975). Eddy (1975) in one of the few anthropological studies of the desegregation process, found that a new educational program, introduced simultaneiously with desegregation, helped to re-establish traditional social status positions. According to Eddy's analysis, the program provided a vehicle for establishing black-white faculty relationships where black teachers were placed in a position of lesser autonomy relative to whites. Following the initial period of faculty desegregation, once the relationships were established, the program was more-or-less discontinued.

Education programs utilized and practices emergent in desegregated schools can be seen primarily as approaches to handling problems resulting from increased diversity among the student body. These approaches reflect assumptions about the basis of the diversity and the value placed on assimilative versus pluralistic models of American society. (See Section II.4)

Tracking and ability grouping are methods of dealing with perceived differences in learning ability. Separation of children according to criteria such as scores on standardized tests results in over-representation of black children in lower groups. Because of this segregative effect, "racially identifiable" classes have been frowned upon by federal agencies and the courts in some cases have found tracking systems to be in violation of the Constitution. (See Section III.1.e.)

Another phenomenon encountered in desegregated schools involves the expulsion of black students by various formal and informal means such as suspensions. These students referred to as "pushouts" in the literature describing such patterns are seen in the schools as behavior and disciplinary problems.

Another approach, compensatory education, involves the provision of remedial programs designed to aid students disadvantaged by their home environments. These programs were originally developed to correct "cultural deprivation" which was posited as a cause of depressed educational outcomes for minority and lower-income children. Federal support for these programs provided through the 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act provided a stimulus for the development of this approach. For various reasons, support for compensatory education is waning.

Another way of conceptualizing improved education and increased educational opportunity for minority students in desegregated schools has been to focus upon diversifying education rather than homogenizing the students. Differences in students are conceived as differences in cultural backgrounds. One of the goals stated in the Minnesota State Board of Education Guideline, for example, contained the following definition of inter-cultural education, as a goal of its system:

> . . . that educational process. . . by which all individuals gain a knowledge, respect, and appreciation for the language patterns, history, heritage, culture, values and contributions to mankind of minority groups with special emphasis on Black-Americans, Spanish-surnamed Americans, American-Indians and Orientals, so as to enable all individuals to live better in a pluralistic society (1971:52).

These approaches vary in their emphases on the degree to which all students are supposed to become multi-cultural and the emphasis placed on mutual respect. Ethnic studies was an early emphasis in this approach. Although this trend has captured the attention of many educators (see Stent, et al. 1973, for example) it has not received the attention on the national level that the shortcomings of compensatory education and desegregation programs have.

A characteristic of the programs which have been utilized, is that they tend to be based on remedies directed primarily to the individual student.. Remedies focused upon alteration of the social order of the school as a result of many factors tend to be less frequent and unadopted on a large scale. An interesting example of such a proposed remedy and one which is based upon a theoretical orientation, is referred to by Cohen (1972a). This remedy harks back to one of the initial components of the argument against segregation presented in Brown. There has been some research which suggests that one reason why school desegregation has not produced uniformly positive outcomes for black children is that the social stigma of being black is often reinforced in the classroom, although social race mixing has occurred. Katz and Benjamin (1960) and Cohen (1972a) found that when black and white students were asked to perform tasks in a laboratory setting, a pattern of white dominance emerged. They believed this pattern to be a result of higher expectations, held by both blacks and whites, for members of the higher status group (factors other than social race were controlled). Cohen describes a training process investigated in the laboratory whereby black and white students' expectations about the task-performing ability of blacks are raised, thus producing a situation in which blacks and whites may interact on an "equal status" basis. Cohen cautions that achievement differences can also provide a basis for a status order in classrooms because achievement is highly rewarded in school. This achievement-based order may often be confounded with the social-race status order, thus making equal status contact between blacks and whites hard to achieve in a traditional school setting.

V. 5.a. Tracking and Ability Grouping

The educational value of a heterogeneous mixture of students by ability versus a homogeneous mixture (referred to as "ability grouping" or "tracking") has been a subject of debate. A good history of research on the effects of grouping is provided by Goldberg, et al. (1966), where studies and discussion on the subject since the 1920's are traced. This research, centering upon the issue of whether students of like ability should be grouped together for instructional purposes, is inconclusive.

More recently, the question of grouping has become entangled with desegregation issues since minority- and lower-income children tend to be placed in lower tracts. A pair of articles by Weber and Pearl (1966) illustrate this trend. Weber argued that grouping can be administratively justified to further the progress of students of differing ability and achievement along a uniform curriculum. Pearl argued against grouping, stressing that slower groups frequently are minority or economically poor student groups. This "academically" based separation then maintains segregation. Green (1973) also argues against grouping via tracking and inadequate testing procedures. She says that grouping reinforces the effects of years of discriminatory treatment in the education of black children by tracking them in separate and unequal classrooms. (For further information see Lacey 1966 and Johnson 1969.)

There has been some court action concerning tracking (see Section III.1.e.). The aspect of tracking isolated by the courts as illegal has been the biased nature of assessment procedures such as standardized tests. In a rare observational study, Rist (1973) found rigid within-class ability grouping in the St. Louis classes he followed for two and a half years. Because of the longitudinal nature of the study and dependence upon observation, he was present to note the processes involved in forming and maintaining the groups. He concludes that the groups were initially established by the teacher on the basis of social class characteristics. If such subtle processes are widespread, court action may prove ineffective toward such methods of isolation and discriminatory treatment.

V. 5.b. Pushouts

In this form of resegregation, a disproportionate number of minority students are expelled, suspended, or encouraged by informal means to leave school. Especially in the South, black students have suffered an unusually high number of school suspensions and expulsions since court-ordered desegregation.

One of the most extensive evaluations of this phenomenon is presented in a report by the Southern Regional Council and the Robert F. Kennedy Memorial (1973). The report surveys rules, regulations, practices, and disciplinary methods used in Southern schools to push blacks out of schools. One finding was that the explusion rate for college is found in Gordon and Wilkerson (1966). They delineate seven categories of emphases in the diverse range of remedies associated with the educational problems of disadvantaged youth. These include:

(1) reading and language development,
(2) extra-curricular innovation,
(3) counseling and guidance,
(4) parental involvement, and
(5) community involvement.

The launching of Project Head Start in the summer of 1965 by the Office of Economic Opportunity as a part of President Lyndon Johnson's War on Poverty represented massive national involvement in compensatory education. Early intervention was a major premise to Head Start programs. Elkind (1969:32) phrases the orientation as follows:

> If disadvantaged children were to profit from what the schools had to offer, it was argued, then they need a "Head Start" in order to catch up with middle-class children.

Payne, et al. (1973) present a critical review of the programmatic facets of Head Start implementation that encompasses paraprofessionals' roles, teachers' qualifications, lunch and snack provisions - nutritional quality and childrens food in-take, transportation for children and parents, and parent and community involvement. Their review delineates three distinct types of Head Start programs: 1) full year/part day, 2) full year/full day, and 3) summer. They further provide a chronology of events in the development of Head Start, its move from the aegis of the Office of Economic Opportunity to HEW's Office of Child Development, and the shift in focus to day care centers during the Nixon administration. Payne et al. describe Head Start programs and include an overview of the critical literature on Head Start, including the Westinghouse-Ohio Report, a study whose design was hotly debated, and whose report on the lack of intellectual achievement of previous Head Start enrollees did much to discredit this form of compensatory education in popular eyes. (For another critical evaluation, see White, et al. 1973. See also Smith and Bissell 1970.) The Payne book also presents a number of proposals for "corrective practices for Head Start type programs, including a major component on "Teaching Parents How to Teach." Basically, the Payne recommendations view the mechanisms of parent and community action involvement of Head Start as in keeping with OEO's "community action" orientation rather than taking a critical view of programs on the basis of their underlying assumptions about the culture of the children.

As delineated in Gordon and Wilkerson (1966) and a more recent selected survey, Compensatory Education Programs, Ages 2 to 8 edited by Julian C. Stanley (1973), the initial impetus of Head Start's early intervention was expanded through the initial Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and later acts to provide on-going intensified programs of remedial and special educational services to children from homes designated as disadvantaged. This expansion included initiation of Follow Through Programs in elementary schools and Upward Bound for high school students. D. Cohen (1972) contrasts the success of Upward Bound programs by their selection of promising (and motivated) participants late in high school and the program's concrete goal of nearly guaranteed college matriculation for its graduates to the largely undifferentiated goals and undifferentiated clientele of other compensatory education programs. He further identifies and criticizes what he sees as common assumptions about the impact of schooling performance on adult success in the job and social world, and about education as an adequate eradicant of poverty via upward job mobility that underlie a diversity of specific compensatory education projects/goals. The assumption he questions is: "that there has been plenty of room at the top and that schooling was the appropriate escalator" (D. Cohen 1972:153).

A range of other criticisms have put compensatory education in disfavor since the Westinghouse Report's initial evaluation in 1969 about the lack of significant difference between Head Start and non-Head Start children on tests of language development and the Stanford Achievement tests. There are those who have found little evidence through test scores that compensatory education has had a positive impact on the intellectual achievement of so-called disadvantaged school children, sufficient to justify the large financial input to the programs.

Other critics have spoken from a different perspective. For example, Baratz and Baratz (1970) criticize early intervention programs for the ethnocentric judgements encompassed in the goals of these programs to alter the black child's home environment, including changing patterns of child-rearing in the home and replacing the child's language and cognitive skills. These goals and their implementation procedures stem, according to the Baratzes, from an ignorance of black culture and deny important strengths within that culture that are integral for designing successful early childhood programs. Stanley (1973) sums up a more fundamental issue that critics such as the Baratzes label "intellectual racism," an issue that is often ignored in the criticisms of those who have argued against compensatory education on the basis of test scores:

> "compensatory education," as presently understood, is counterproductive. It seems to stem, on the one hand, from the kinds of motivations Winschel (1970) describes - prejudice, do-goodness, conscience-salving, and maintenance of the status quo - and, on the other hand, from a reluctance to tackle the larger project of revamping our entire educational structure (Stanley 1973:205).

The differences between these two sets of critics, in other words, seem to lie in the degree to which an assimilative versus a pluralistic model of American society is held. (See Section II.4.) In any event, support for compensatory education has been seriously eroded.

V. 5.d. Multi-cultural Approaches

Emergent in the late 1960's was a trend to replace the heavy emphasis on compensatory education - eschewed for its negative connotations - with ethnic and cultural heritage programs in elementary and secondary public schools. In recommending passage of the Emergency School Aid and Quality Integrated Education bill, the House committee (as quoted in Giles 1974:6) iterated the goal of this shift in emphasis by its conclusion that:

> children with differing languages and cultures must be allowed to learn and respect the language and culture of the group to which they belong. All children will benefit from an opportunity to learn about the diverse cultural heritage of their classmates.

A heterogeneous school environment as prerequisite for achieving equality of educational opportunity was thereby set forth not only as a matter of the composition of school populations by social race, but integration and quality education were explicitly expanded in definition to encompass the curriculum as well.

The impetus for multi-cultural approaches in school curricula, however, predates federal statute recognition. Its developmental directions can be viewed in a diverse range of curriculum and teacher resource guides initiated from the mid-sixties on by individual school systems (see Daheim 1965, and New York City Board of Education 1968 for early examples) in response to minority student needs/pressures for relevant course content or to state curriculum reform mandates. This trend largely involved what became referred to as "ethnic studies." (For example, see the Pennsylvania State Department of Public Instruction's booklet by Haller 1970, designed to answer social studies teachers' questions about implementing new state regulations that require integrating "major contributions made by Negroes and other racial and ethnic groups" into all state public school courses on United States and Pennsylvania history.)

A major division in approaches to curriculum integration has to do with the degree to which "ethnic studies" is set apart from other courses. One philosophy stated in a 1970 survey by Education U.S.A. as that advocated by nearly all educators holds that:

> the ultimate and ideal way to handle material on blacks and other ethnic groups is to weave it into the regular curriculum as an integral part of everything that is taught from kindergarten to grade 12 (National School Public Relations Association 1970:4).

The survey also reported descriptive information about curriculum projects in selected U.S. cities that follow a second philosophy in implementing a multi-cultural approach: separate courses on ethnic groups, such as African heritage classes in schools, or high school courses - required or elective - ranging from Afro-American history to Swahili to Latin American and Asian studies.

A more recent and evaluative look at school district curriculum guides and programs that follow these two philosophies operative in the ethnic studies field is presented in Giles (1974). In reviewing Afro-American studies programs from a number of school districts, he notes variations as to whether there are separate black studies courses for black students only, separate courses in minority studies for white students, and so forth. He labels and criticizes three distinct orientations to black studies: contributionism, black identity, and a thematic approach.

Controversy discernable in the literature over ethnic study approaches to education reflects some of the major controversies inherent in the differences between general perspectives on desegregation (see Section II) and argued in the question of the causes of educational failure (see Section IV). A yearbook published by the National Council for the Social Studies on teaching ethnic studies provides a good example of the underlying themes as manifest in critiques by proponents of ethnic study approaches. One contributor to the volume edited by Banks (1973), Larry Cuban, focuses on the teacher as the most important variable in achieving multi-cultural perspectives and addresses questions of teacher attitudes, behavior, and strategies as well as academic training. Anthropologist Mildred Dickeman locates what she calls the racist design of schools in their function to perpetuate American middle-class economic goals that pit personal individual success against family and kinship loyalties in which ethnic heritage is rooted. Thus, she cautions that ethnic studies which emphasize culture hero "success" stories may undercut the very ethnic identity they aim to reaffirm. Contributor Barbara Sizemore contends that curriculum revision and teacher recruitment alone are band-aid approaches. Multi-cultural learning must involve a restructuring of schools so that they become institutions for education rather than indoctrination. At present, multi-cultural approaches are in a formative period. The criticisms given in the 1973 volume referred to above indicate that with regard to ethnic studies, one of the earliest manifestations, multi-cultural approaches were still in 1973 a subject of debate as to what constitute their essential characteristics.

A second basic multi-cultural approach which has to some extent augmented or replaced the ethnic studies emphasis (Giles 1974:146) concerns more basic elements of the learning-teaching matrix. To some extent based upon and respondent to cultural differences (see Section IV.3.d.), these approaches consider alternative learning styles that tend to vary with ethnic background. Bilingual programs represent one direction of such an approach. A legal precedent for bilingual programs was set in 1968 by the Bilinqual Education Act - Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Francesco Cordasco, with Diego Castellanos (Banks 1973), presents an overview of this legislation in the context of methodological issues involved in educating Puerto Rican children who enter the public school system from homes in which Spanish is the spoken language. Education for such children, these authors state, must begin with the language of the child:

> While learning to read and write his mother tongue [Spanish], the child needs careful training in learning, understanding, and speaking English as a Second Language (ESL) through an aural-oral approach before learning to read and write it. (1973:231)

Thus, "bilingual education" is defined as instruction in two languages. The alternative to using both English and Spanish as media of instruction of the school's curriculum for Puerto Rican children has been, according to Cordasco and Castellanos, "functional illiteracy" in both languages (Banks 1973:228). However, these authors follow the impetus of other multi-cultural approaches already reviewed in maintaining that:

> . . . the instructural use of the Spanish language in the classroom is not sufficient in itself to improve the education of these children and that a new curriculum must be devised with cultural as well as language requirements. A truly effective program of bilinqual education should encompass bicultural education as well. It should include systematic curricular coverage of the history and heritage of Puerto Rico. In fact, such inclusions often are as important for the student's effective development as the use of the Spanish language is for developing his cognitive skills, or as the learning of English as a second language is for his socio-economic survival (1973:234).

The methodological issues delineated by "bilingual education" approaches are also evidenced in the questions raised by educators and linguists about the distinct and systematic characteristics of English spoken by Afro-American children, which is called by various terms: Non-Standard Negro English, "Black English" (Aarons, et al. 1969; Dillard 1973). Identification of the structure of this spoken language is viewed by many as a key to developing processes of teaching reading to black children.

V. 5.e. Staff Adjustment

Although there are a few studies of the social processes which occur in the establishment of behavioral patterns in newly desegregated schols (Peterson 1975, Eddy 1975), the topic has primarily been a concern of program developers seeking to assist teachers in the transition. Five approaches are discernable in these desegregation training programs.

One such approach places major emphasis upon increasing personnel sensitivity toward the ethnic student's problems. Frequently programs centered around such topics are presented at summer institutes or in the form of inservice courses. An example of such an institute is described by Fielder and Dychman (1967). This institute was held for a selected group of teachers and community members to develop skills, techniques, and understandings necessary to solve problems incident to desegregation. (Also see Banaka, et al. 1971.)

A second approach includes curriculum guides and teacher guide books for multi-ethnic classrooms. An example of such a handbook is one developed by the federally funded Far West Laboratory for Education Research and Development to acquaint school personnel with data relevant to black people in the U.S. (Forbes n.d.). Other handbooks of this type are oriented toward human relations. (See Oklahoma State Department of Education 1971 and Arnez 1973.)

The third approach advocates establishment of special teaching and counselor positions to help in desegregation. Smith (1971), for example, details how a guidance counselor model could be revised to be more influential for black students. (Also see Kaplan and Coleman 1963, and Bryson and Mowu 1973.)

A fourth approach seeks to analyze student behavior in such a way as to help teachers and counselors deal with multi-racial classes. For example, Noar 1966 provides a guide for beginning teachers who will be involved in desegregation. Other references following this mode are Willie 1964, Klopf and Bowman 1966, Burger 1968, and Vontress 1969.

A final approach reflecting perhaps the "human potential movement" in psychology included sensitivity training through directed small group interaction. Westphal 1970, for example, describes such training sessions used in Minneapolis to make city personnel more aware of attitudes that can frustrate equal opportunity programs. Irvine and Brierley 1973 describe another series of sessions or workshops which were conducted to assist teams of public school teachers and principals, involving both blacks and whites, in interpersonal relations. For other examples see Caliguir 1970, T. Clark 1970, Levine and Mares 1970, and Lowe 1973.

VI. Research on Outcomes of Desegregation

Beginning in the late 1950's, interest in the effects of desegregation on public school led social scientists to undertake many varied studies of social race mixing in the educational system. Some of these studies, which will be discussed in this section, are directed at investigating the consequences for children and staff of mixing blacks and whites in schools and classrooms.

Research on social race mixing, or desegregation, in schools usually focuses on differences between students in segregated and desegregated situations. One problem in comparing findings from these studies lies in the fact that "desegregated" school settings have been defined by a range of black-white ratios. Pettigrew (1969) has argued that desegregated schools may vary widely in the quality of interracial contact that takes place within them. When the school climate is characterized by a high degree of interracial acceptance, more positive outcomes may be expected . There are other problems as well. Some studies compare desegregated schools while others compare classrooms. The circumstances under which desegregation takes place, such as school attendance plans, changing residential patterns and ability grouping are also important. These are significant differences which are sometimes ignored in interpreting research results.

The outcomes variables, or the consequences of desegregation, can be grouped under three major headings: educational, psychological and social outcomes. These headings reflect the particular orientations of the social scientists who have done the majority of the work on desegregation outcomes. Because many studies have been narrowly focused, there has been little attempt to integrate the findings from these diverse approaches; however, the findings under each contribute to a general understanding of the consequences of desegregation. The outcome variables, too, have been variously defined and will be described in the subsections which follow.

To date, most of the research has focused on the early grades and has been conducted in the North where neighborhood or natural desegregation (changes in school populations as a result of changing residential patterns), rather than desegregation which requires large-scale transfer of pupils, is the rule. This research has been carried by white investigators. Most of the studies also have been cross-sectional in design, meaning that they compare black and white children across schools of differing racial percentages. There has been less emphasis on longitudinal studies which would allow a look at the effects of sustained change as students proceed through desegregated schools. Both types of studies, however, often fail or are unable to match students in comparison groups by characteristics such as family background, school quality, or achievement scores upon entering the desegregated situation in order that observed differeces between segregated and desegregated blacks may be explained by other variations - such as school quality. Case studies, though not necessarily representative, would provide more information on the process of desegregation and the subsequent establishment of social patterns than do cross-sectional or longitudinal studies based on limited knowledge of the cultural context.

After nearly two decades, desegregation research remains at the descriptive level in the sense that it has mainly documented what has happened as a result of desegregation. Studies have demonstrated patterns of black-white differences on outcome variables, but attempts at generalizing black-white patterns have not been particularly successful. Non-significant or mixed findings for research hypotheses, the wide range of background and extraneous variables which are hard to measure but which may theoretically be considered influential, as well as differences in sample populations, tests administered, variables studied and controlled, measures used for eliciting information, and procedures used in analyzing data limit the comparability of research efforts. There has generally been a lack of theoretical development in the field of desegregation research and, as a result, little is understood about why desegregation has such different results in different situations.

To conclude, findings from the desegregation research to date suggest that social race mixing alone has little consistent effect on black-white outcomes. Such different results indicate a need to look at a multiplicity of factors rather than isolated variables when investigating desegregation outcomes.

Reviews of the research on outcomes of desegregation are presented in Weinburg (1968) and St. John (1975). St. John's work is especially good for its appendices which list studies under each of the outcome variables by location, target population, instruments, controls, and tests used as well as summaries of comparisons made and results obtained. Weinburg reviews a large number of unpublished works. Volume 39 (No. 2, 1975) of the journal, Law and Contemporary Problems, includes short recent overviews of the research on these outcome variables.

VI. 1. Educational Outcomes

By far the greatest amount of desegregation research time and money has been spent on investigating the question: What effects does social race mixing have on educational success for black and white children? The most ambitious work on educational outcomes is the national survey conducted by James Coleman and associates (Coleman, et al. 1966) entitled Equality of Educational Opportunity Survey (EEOS). This survey was commissioned by the U.S. Congress as a provision of the 1964 Civil Rights Act and was designed to investigate the availability of educational opportunities in public education to individuals by social race, color, religion, and national origin. The research involved studying 570,000 school children and 60,000 teachers at 4,000 schools. Although psychological and social outcomes were investigated as part of this reasearch, the primary emphasis was on the explanation of differences in educational outcomes. In interpreting their task, the researchers defined educational outcomes rather narrowly as academic achievement and investigated the effects of family background, school curriculum and facilities, and teacher and student body characteristics on academic achievement test scores.

Most studies of educational effects, both before and after the Coleman survey, have also focused on achievement scores. A few studies investigate academic attainment (amount of education completed) and subsequent occupational attainment as indicators of educational success.

Staff displacement and changes in the educational system as a result of desegregation, which might also be considered outcomes of desegregation, have been included in Section V.

VI. 1.a. Academic Achievement

Academic achievement is the variable most often used to measure the effect of desegregation on students' educational success. Academic achievement in desegregation research has usually been assessed by comparing standardized IQ or achievement test scores (verbal and math achievement scores are sometimes evaluated separately or they may be lumped as an indication of general ability) for blacks in segregated versus desegregated schools, for blacks in desegregated schools with national test score norms, or by comparing the extent of the gap between black and white scores for students in the two types of schools.

A number of cautions are advised when interpreting the results of research on desegregation and academic achievement. First, changing social and political climates manifest by such things as changing social-race composition of neighborhoods and changing desegregation policies since 1954 (when comparative data on black-white differences on standardized test scores were first published) makes cross-study comparisons tenuous. In the earlier studies (those before 1966), for example, achievement was sometimes measured by grades as well as by test scores. Increases in black achievement scores for desegregated pupils were more frequently reported during that period. The use of grades as measures of achievement was soon discouraged because it was felt that teachers' perceptions of academic standards and evaluation as well as the content of the material they taught differed so greatly both within and between schools as to severely bias grades. These early results may also reflect the fact that most blacks in desegregated schools during that period were there by choice as a result of neighborhood desegregation and that most "desegregated" schools had only a few token blacks and remained predominantly white. These conditions no longer exist in many parts of the country where court decisions of the 1960's and early 1970's have required desegregation programs which insure racial balance through the requirement of district-wide desegregation or large-scale busing.

From the mid 1960's to the present, achievement and IQ test scores rather than grades have been used as the criterion for measuring academic growth because they were believed to represent an objective measure of children's progress in school. Recently problems associated with the use of these tests have been pointed out, and the assumption that they are "objective" measures has been challenged. Since test scores are sometimes used to assign students to classrooms, as with ability grouping, or associated with selection of students for schools where special programs are offered as incentives to desegregation, blacks and whites of unusually high ability may be concentrated in certain "desegregated" situations. If these situations are included as cases in the sample studied, achievement score changes will reflect selection processes rather than desegregation effects. Secondly, a number of studies have shown that these standardized tests are biased in favor of white middle-income children because the material covered by the tests is more likely to be familiar to those children than to minority group children (see Section IV. 3.c for more information on this argument). Others have suggested that achievement scores measure conceptual abilities which are developed through the interaction of parents with their children before they enter school rather than skills which the school itself is trying to teach and for which the school should be held accountable (see, for example, Shaycoft 1967). The importance of the question of how well achievement scores measure what is learned in schools has been recently underscored by the fact that desegregated blacks tend to do better than segregated blacks on math, but not verbal achievement scores. (For reports of studies which investigate these and other important variables with regard to achievement and desegregation, see Denmark 1970, St. John and Lewis 1971, and Mayer, et al. 1974.) Since math skills are learned primarily in school, math tests may more accurately reflect the effect of school conditions on achievement. These potentially contaminating situations must be carefully controlled and the limitations of the measures used must be considered in evaluating reported changes in academic achievement with desegregation.

In general, studies have shown that black students' scores do not seem to be adversely affected by the desegregated situation and may improve substantially in certain circumstances. However, the achievement gap between black and white students remains and tends to increase with grade level. Overall, findings are mixed on the question of whether or not desegregation significantly improves the scores of black students. No adverse effects on whites' achievement scores have been reported except in cases where they attend predominantly black schools. However, changing background characteristics of the white population in predominantly black schools as a result of increased pressure to desegregate all public schools has not been carefully studied.

Surprisingly, little research effort has been expended on investigating the black-white ratio most favorable to improved black scores. Coleman, et al.'s data (1966) suggested that school social-class differences accounted for the effects of percentage white on achievement scores, but the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights (1967b) reported that when both family, school, and social class were controlled, blacks in majority white classrooms did significantly better. In an attempt to resolve this apparent contradiction, Cohen, Pettigrew, and Riley (1972) reanalyzed the EEOS data and found that the effect of school social-class was shared with the effect of racial composition, and the two could not be disentangled. Jencks and Brown (1975), in another reanalysis of EEOS, compared achievement test scores for first and sixth graders while controlling for racial composition. Findings suggested that the highest gains for both blacks and whites occurred in schools which were 51% to 75% white. However, blacks registered some gains in all schools where they comprised between 10% and 75% of the population.

Other factors which have recently been investigated for their effects on achievement scores include procedures for achieving desegregation (Armor 1972a and Pettigrew, et al. 1973) and the quality of teachers (see, for example, St. John 1971, and Hanushek 1972).

VI. 1.b. Educational Attainment

In evaluating the effects of desegregation on education, a few researchers have investigated the relationship between attendance at desegregated versus segregated schools and the number of years students stay in schools (educational attainment). Like those reported for the effects of desegregation on academic achievement, findings on educational attainment are inconclusive. There is some evidence to suggest that desegregated blacks and particularly those who enter desegregated schools at an early age are likely to attain more years of education than those who stay segregated, but there remains a substantial gap between median years of education for desegregated black versus white students (see, for example, Crain 1971 and Hanushek 1972).

Recently several researchers have suggested that whatever gains some black students in desegregated schools are making in educational attainment are more than offset by the increased number of black students who dropout, are pushed out or are expelled from desegregated schools, thus restricting their access to many jobs (see, for example, Watson 1975 and Armor 1972b). (For other factors which affect dropout and pushout rates for blacks, see Section VI. 3. Also see Section V. 5.b.) Results from the Coleman Survey indicate that high school dropout rates and college attendance are not related to social race when family background and test scores are controlled; however the research was conducted before large-scale desegregation was underway. Others have called into question the importance of number of years of formal education.

The perceived link between educational attainment and occupational attainment has been one of the factors underlying interest in how long children stay in school. This belief that formal educational attainment is a good predictor of income level or occupation was brought under suspicion by a highly publicized analysis of the Coleman data by Jencks, *et al.* (1972). That study demonstrates the difficulty in trying to establish a direct relationship between years in school and eventual income level. Jencks, *et al.* argued that equalizing educational attainment will not alleviate the economic inequality existing between blacks and whites in the United States today. These findings and their interpretation have been subjected to much criticism including the fact that some high-paying jobs require little formal education, while at the same time some very low-paying jobs, such as teaching, require considerable education. Despite the criticisms, the Jencks, *et al.* position has served to weaken the beliefs of those who support education as a means of reducing inequality and stratification in America.

VI. 2. Psychological Outcomes

Though not as extensively researched as educational outcomes, the psychological effects of school desegregation have always been considered important. The 1954 Brown decision was supported in part by reports of a number of social scientists who indicated in their findings that school segregation produced a detrimental psychological effect on black children. Concern over the psychological costs of desegregation is still being voiced, particularly in regard to token blacks or whites in "desegregated" schools (see, for example, Rist 1976).

As has been characteristic of work on other outcomes, attempts at integrating the material on psychological effects has been hampered by differences in research design and the biases of researchers working in the field. Some have stressed improving aspects of personality as ends in themselves because they improve the state of black mental health, while others have focused on personality factors as they affect educational outcomes. Very little work has emphasized the role of peer groups on psychological outcomes. Theoretical issues such as the relationship among various intrapersonal characteristics and the extent to which social and educational conditions determine psychological outcomes remain unresolved.

The section has been divided into five portions which cover the major aspects of personality investigated in relation to desegregation. For a good recent review of what is known about the psychological impact of desegregation, see Epps 1975.

VI. 2.a. Orientation Toward Achievement

An early study which provided the basis for much of the later work on desegregation and achievement orientation was conducted by Rosen. Writing in 1959, he hypothesized that different social mobility rates for black and white adults could be explained by dissimilar orientations toward achievement. These different orientations were thought to come about as a result of differing socialization patterns in the home. Rosen broke down what he called the "achievement syndrome" into three elements: motivation or inclination to achieve, values which guide preferences and goals, and educational and occupational aspirations. Rosen found that blacks scored as high or higher than whites on educational aspirations and that both placed a high value on achievement, but blacks scored much lower on motivation to achieve. Rosen concluded that the reality of segregation for blacks had not encouraged the development of behavior patterns which would lead to achievement of desired goals.

This framework for conceptualizing the relationship between psychological and social factors which contribute to "success" was characteristic of much of the work which followed on the impact of desegregation on orientation toward achievement in schools. It was repeatedly found that most black parents aspired to the same or higher level of attainment for their children as did white parents (see, for example, Krysta, Chesler, and White 1967 and Smith, Flory, Bashshur, and Shannon 1967). The fact that black children seldom achieved those high goals was explained by the fact that black parents had been denied the opportunity to compete in the white-dominated sector of society, had not developed the behavioral mechanisms for success in the white work, and therefore could not train their children in them (see, for example, Katz 1967a).

Inspite of the fact that differences in academic motivation were thought to exist between blacks and whites, the element of achievement orientation which has received the most attention with regard to desegregation is the different levels of educational and occupational aspirations of blacks and whites. Most studies of aspirations have been done on high school students through the use of questionnaires which ask about plans and expectations for the future. Findings have shown that black students in segregated schools tend to have higher aspirations than those in desegregated schools (see, for example, Armor 1972a, Bachman 1970). Blacks were found to be more likely to want to attend college but less likely to have taken steps to prepare themselves for college (see, for example, Coleman, et al. 1966). There is also evidence to suggest that blacks define their life chances in terms of the more restricted range of opportunities which have traditionally been available in the black community - such as attending black universities and training for jobs such as teachers, doctors and ministers (see, for example, Falk and Cosby 1974).

The fact that aspirations seem to be higher for segregated blacks has led some researchers to hypothesize that the desegregated black student lowers his aspirations to a more realistic level because direct contact with whites provides him with a better understanding of the competition he must face to get through school successfully and to acquire a job. Some argue that reduced and more realistic aspirations should increase the academic motivation of black students (see, for example, Katz 1967a). It has been argued, on the other hand that contact with whites in a desegregated school demoralizes black students, thus reducing aspirations as well as motivation (see, for example, Bachman 1970). Tests of these hypotheses are inconclusive (see, for example, Hall and Wiant 1973, Veroff and Peele 1969). Still another approach to dealing with the apparent negative effect of desegregation on aspirations has been to link aspirations with an individual's sense of control over his environment. Coleman, et al. (1966) found that sense of control was greater for desegregated blacks. This finding has led some researcher to argue that increased sense of control compensates for lowered aspirations in motivating achievement. Increased satisfaction with school as expressed by desegregated blacks is another positive outcome which has been associated with increased academic motivation (see, for example, Williams and Venditti 1969).

VI. 2.b. Self-Concept

The study of how self-concept is affected by desegregation has been carried out under a number of names including self-confidence, self-image, and self-esteem. Self-concept as used here encompasses all of these and the concept is usually defined as the feelings one has about self which come about as a result of interaction with others.

Since the 1930's, psychologists have postulated that the social stigma attached to being black produced a low self-concept. Seward (1956) argued that skin color was an integral part of the concept of self. Studies of the development of racial awareness in children suggest that from the ages of three to seven, children are learning labels and affective connotations associated with social race groups (see Goodman 1964, Proshansky and Newton 1968). Clark and Clark (1947) demonstrated that both black and white children preferred white dolls over black dolls and that more positive character traits were associated with the white dolls. A large number of studies since that time have confirmed the Clarks' finding and have demonstrated the range of negative connotations which both whites and blacks associate with black skin color. (See, for example, Williams 1966; Williams, Best, Wood and Filler 1973, and Redisch and Weissback 1974; for a study of the resultant anxiety which blacks feel, see McDonald 1970.) A few recent studies have suggested that this tendency to associate black skin color and negative characteristics may no longer be as pronounced among either blacks or whites (see, for example, Brigham 1974). The need for elimination of the debilitating effects of segregation on self-concept was cited as evidence favoring desegregation in the 1954 Brown decision. It was hoped that desegregation of schools would improve black self-concepts.

Although some studies have indicated that direct contact between blacks and whites does increase self-concept and produce better cross-color understanding (see, for example, Coles 1963,1967; Busk, Ford and Schulman 1973; and for positive results among adults, see Pettigrew 1969a). The composite findings show no significant differences in self-concept as a result of desegregation. St. John (1975) charts ten studies on self-concept which indicate that black self-concept decreases as percentage white in the classroom increases. (See especially Rosenberg and Simons 1970.) Coleman, et al. (1966) found that self-concept fell as a result of desegregation while sense of control over environment rose. McPartland's (1968) reanalysis of Coleman's data confirmed the finding and, as was the case with orientation toward achievement, sense of environmental control was posited as a positive outcome of desegregation which might compensate for lowered self-concept. It is also argued that the advantages of direct black-white contact on self-concept may be offset for blacks by fear of failure, perception of a very wide gap between ability levels, or feelings that probability of success in school is low because whites seem to perform better and have access to more status-rewarding activities.

Since self-concept is defined in terms of an individual's feeling about his status relative to those with whom he has contact, it seems likely that certain people will exert more influence on self-concept than others. Some researchers have begun to focus on how different reference groups or "audiences," such as parents, neighborhood peers, and teachers and classmates with which a child particularly identifies or associates contribute to self-concept outcomes. Epps (1975) argues that societal status is superseded by status within a small reference group, especially for young children, and that they do not become aware of the stigma attached to being black until they confront whites at school, where whites receive more institutional rewards. A. Cohen (1968) argues that self-concept is dependent on a person's perception of how important he is to those around him. Thus, the perception that whites do better in school leads those blacks who do not have the skills to compete academically to turn to non-academic reference groups in which they can enjoy the rewards of importance and high status. In an interesting study, Shaw (1974) shows that black and white children differ with regard to aspects of self-concept.

Blacks, for example, see themselves as more hostile and more independent than whites although overall black-white self-concept scores are not significantly affected by desegregation of the schools. Denmark (1970) reports that self-concepts of black males improve more than those for black females in a desegregated situation. She suggests this finding may be due to the fact that males can achieve higher status positions in the school, as in sports, which are not available to girls (see also Yarrow, Campbell and Yarrow 1958 for more on the special hardships encountered by desegregated girls).

VI. 2.c. Anxiety

From the outset, many social scientists have worried about the emotional strain which black children entering newly desegregated schools might feel. Certainly there were reasons for concern: black students would be entering schools as strangers and as perceived inferiors. St. John (1975) summarizes seven articles which report the relation of school desegregation to measured anxiety. Although a dominant concern of psychologists is the possible increase of emotional stress in black children with desegregation, St. John points out the rather inconclusive results of the studies. There generally is no significant relation between increased anxiety and desegregation which has been isolated (for examples of studies on anxiety and desegregation, see Mahan and Mahan 1971).

Studies by Coles (1967), Nash (1968), and Chesler and Segal (1970) document the fear and rejection which early black desegregators felt, especially in the South. Coles' findings suggest, however, that these initially stressful conditions were not permanently damaging psychologically to most of the children involved. Other studies have suggested that blacks are more anxious than whites about being accepted by peers and teachers at school (for brief summaries of the literature of these and other factors related to anxiety and desegregation, see O'Reilly 1970, Chapter 3). Katz 1967a has suggested that the circumstances surrounding desegregation as well as treatment of black students in desegregated schools are particularly important in determining anxiety levels. He fears that once anxiety is produced as a result of feelings of rejection when blacks cannot compete in the white-dominated school, the motivation levels and thus the achievement levels of black children will further decline (for more on aspirations and motivations, see Subsection 2.a. above).

VI. 3. Social Outcomes

Desegregation has been supported by some blacks and other Civil Rights advocates as a means of alleviating gross discrimination against black minority group members in the United States. One of the original concerns of social scientists and others who advocated desegregated schools was the reduction of the social stigma attached to being black. Although there have been myriad small-scale studies of children's attitudes about and preferences for same- vs. cross-color association (stigma has been operationalized as racial attitudes), the question of whether or not cross-color contact in desegregated schools has produced the desired social outcome of reducing the stigma associated with being black remains equivocal. The findings are that racial attitudes are affected by desegregation but the direction of the change is unclear.

Results of studies such as those by Yarrow, Campbell, and Yarrow (1958), Coles (1967), and Chesler and Segal (1970) suggest that prejudice is reduced while Dentler and Elkins' study (1967) finds that prejudice increases in a desegregated setting. St. John (1975) compared studies on social outcomes by grade level, research design, behavior vs. attitude studies, type of desegregation plan, and individual student characteristics and found only one consistent pattern in the findings: there is a general preference for same-color members as friends and work partners.

Pettigrew (1969b) has underscored the importance of the amount and type of interracial contact which takes place in a desegregated school. He argues that desired desegregated outcomes can occur only in school settings where interracial acceptance is espoused. In an attempt to explain the circumstances which contribute to positive interracial settings, recent attention has shifted away from a narrow view of the social outcomes as being changes in students' prejudicial attitudes about desegregation and toward investigation of a variety of indicators of the social milieu, including beliefs and preferences concerning interracial contact as well as behaviors which mark it. All participants in a school are seen as contributing to the social milieu through the attitudes they have about desegregation, different types of students, and the education process.

Some researchers (Leacock 1969, E. Cohen 1972b, for example) have drawn attention to the importance of the larger context for evaluating social outcomes. Community attitudes toward the school would be one such factor. Another researcher along a similar line, recently commented that the traditional classroom structure dominated by the teacher and stressing individual achievement may work against the development of close interpersonal relationships among students in general, thus limiting opportunity for positive social interaction which might reduce prejudice (Coleman 1976). In several instances, case studies have been used to investigate social milieu in desegregated schools (see, for example, Fuchs 1969 and Kimball and Wagley 1974; for the same type of study on predominately black schools, see Eddy 1967, Leacock 1969, and Rist 1973). These studies provide valuable information on how particular social milieu, especially the behavioral aspects, influence outcomes.

The subsections which follow are organized in terms of three principal indicators of interracial social milieu: cross-color beliefs, cross-color acceptance, and cross-color interaction patterns.

VI. 3.a. Cross-Color Beliefs

The study of cross-color beliefs has centered on the development of racial awareness, expectations of social race differences, and beliefs about appropriate interaction between blacks and whites. Very early studies established the fact that children recognize differences between blacks and whites, associate more negative traits with blacks than with whites and realize these distinctions as early as the age of three or four (see, for example, Criswell 1937, Clark and Clark 1947 and Goodman 1964). More recent studies suggest that these conclusions are still valid (see, for example, Porter 1971) and provide little new information.

Although the nature of the link has recently been questioned (see Sartain 1966), parents are generally believed to have an important influence on children's beliefs (see, for example, Clark 1955 and Proshansky and Newton 1967). Adult beliefs about desegregation have undergone reversals. Campbell and Hatchett (1976), for example, report that in 1964 the majority of whites in the U.S. were opposed to desegregation. By 1970 most whites favored it, but by 1974 only one-third of whites interviewed favored desegregation. The data on blacks shows that the majority has always favored desegregation although the percentage in favor had declined by 1974.

Peer groups have also been thought to have a significant effect on beliefs. (See, for example, work by Crockett 1957 and Alexander and Campbell 1964 for the effect of peer groups on decisions by blacks to attend predominantly white schools.) Peer group factors, however, have not been carefully studied. Similarly, the changing influence of parents and peers on beliefs during the course of the school career has not been systematically studied (St. John 1975).

VI. 3.b. Cross-Color Acceptance

Research on outcomes of cross-color acceptance usually involves the investigation of changes in the extent of prejudiced, biased, or stereotypic attitudes as a result of desegregation. In response to the early findings of racial stereotyping and awareness among young children (Clark and Clark 1947, Goodman 1964), the reduction of racial prejudice became a highly valued outcome of the desegregation of schools. However, it has been researched in only a limited manner.

Although some contend that attitudes mediate behavior (see, for example, Carithers 1970), the extent to which verbally expressed racial prejudice, such as the association of negative character traits to black dolls, is important to actual interracial behavior has never been empirically determined. A number of studies suggest that there is very little correspondence (see, for example, Porter 1971).

Sartain (1966) found no clear connection between parental and child attitudes, but there was a close correlation between children's attitudes and the attitudes children reported for their parents. This finding suggests the need to look at perceptions of cross-color attitudes rather than self-designated attitudes as a measure of social outcomes. Evidence for this need is provided by McDowell (1967) who found that black willingness to establish cross-color relationships was directly related to anticipation of a positive reaction by whites to the association.

Although a number of studies have shown that the extent of prejudicial attitudes varies with family background and individual characteristics such as sex, social class, and lightness of skin color, (see, for example, Gottlieb and TenHouten 1965, Porter 1971, and Lewis and St. John 1974), most researchers continue to assume that same-color children, especially whites, hold similar negative attitudes and then proceed to measure these attitudes without controlling for relevant background factors.

Generally, the findings on cross-color acceptance are mixed. For evidence of less racial acceptance after desegregation, see Campbell (1958), Armor (1972a), and Green and Gerard (1974); for evidence of better interracial attitudes see Gardner, et al. 1970, Sachdeva 1973. One trend in the findings is that blacks tend to become more tolerant of whites while whites become less tolerant of blacks in the desegregated school (see, for example, Chesler and Segal 1970, and Herman 1970).

Some researcher have tried to identify circumstances which engender reduced levels of prejudice. Koslin, et al. (1972) found that interracial attitudes were more favorable when classrooms were composed of approximately equal numbers of black and white students. Although black and white friendship choices were still less than would be expected by chance, there was significantly less racial polarization in the classroom and more cross-color friendships were noted. There is some indication that length of time in a desegregated school encourages a positive outcome (McParland 1968). This finding lends support to those who argue that desegregation in the early grades is essential because racial prejudice is not yet firmly established and change can be more easily effected. This trend is further substantiated by research indicating that blacks and whites who live in desegregated residential areas and who have attended desegregated schools have very low prejudice levels (see, for example, Crain 1968).

Considering the likelihood of its importance to black-white relations in schools, the question of cross-color acceptance of teachers by students has been only slightly researched. What evidence there is suggests that black students feel closer to and are more accepting of black teachers and that the presence of black teachers and other staff members in the school may reduce black drop-out rates and alienation (see, for example, Riccio and Barner, 1973, Darkenwald 1975 and Erickson 1975).

VI. 3.c. Cross-Color Interaction Patterns

The data on cross-color interaction in desegregated situations come almost exclusively from sociometric tests of association. These tests ask children to name their friends or schoolmates with whom they prefer to work or play. Although these tests do not measure actual behavior, choice of work or play mates is considered an indication of a predisposition to interact with particular individuals. The use of sociometric tests has been questioned on a number of grounds; some have argued that it is similar beliefs or perceived ability to accomplish a task and not race which influences friendship choices (see, for example Hendricks _et al_. 1973). Another problem with the use of sociometric tests has been the failure in some cases to correct for the probability of same-group preference as racial percentages in the classroom change (St. John 1975). Comparatively few researchers have studied interaction patterns by direct observation of children in schools. Studies of cross-color behavior are different from other studies of desegregation outcomes in the sense that patterns cannot be compared between segregated and desegregated schools but only in schools where black and white children have contact with each other.

The picture of desegregation outcomes is no less clouded by a look at the findings on interaction patterns. Generally, interracial associations are few (see for example Siverman and Shaw 1973). Results are variable depending on the racial percentages in the classroom:

as the percentage of the minority group increases, sociometric tests show more cross-color choices but same-color preference or racial polarization remains pronounced (see for example Fox 1966; Koslin, et al. 1972; and St. John and Lewis 1975). This general trend of color-restricted friendship choices, particularly as minorities become more isolated in the classroom, seems important to other desegregation outcomes. For example, Webster and Kroger (1966) reported that more cross-color friendships were associated with higher self-concept, while Coleman, et al. (1966) and St. John and Lewis (1975) report a relationship between more cross-race friendships and higher academic achievement.

In studies of actual observed behavior, there seems to be more informal and spontaneous interracial association in elementary schools than in high schools where black-white associations occur only in the context of formal classroom or extracurricular activities (Dwyer 1958, St. John 1964). Kimball and Wagley (1974) found that blacks and whites in high schools developed parallel systems of extracurricular activities while Gottlieb and TenHouten (1965) suggest that the amount and the type of black participation in school activities depends on the social race composition of the school: when blacks are in a small minority, they generally do not participate in school activities: as percentage black increases, separate systems develop; and where blacks constitute a majority as a result of white flight, blacks assume roles in all activities. Others have noted the effects of teacher attitudes and classroom procedures on black-white behavior, suggesting the need for attention to producing social climates which will encourage positive interaction (see for example Crain 1973, Frenk 1973, King and Mayer 1973, Cusick 1974, and Gay 1974).

Investigating the aspects of the social climate produced when blacks and whites interact in a laboratory setting, Katz and Benjamin (1960) and E. Cohen (1972a) found that black-white interaction was often characterized by white dominance, suggesting that social status differences discouraged blacks from interacting with whites. They theorized that this situation could be improved by establishing "equal status" relationships between members of the two groups. A positive change in interaction style was affected by training which raised expectations for black performance. Although more difficult to implement in the classroom, measures such as this point to ways in which teachers can effect positive interaction results among their students (for information on similar studies emphasizing cooperative behaviors, see Roper 1971, and Silverthorne, et al. 1974).

VI. 4. A Curious Discrepancy

As initially conceived, one of the purposes of school desegregation was the elimination of the stigmatization of black children. Stigmatization was seen as a social process involving the restriction of black children to low-status schools. Most researchers who have chosen to study the outcomes of desegregation, however, have tended to conceptualize their task as studying the effects of cross-color schoolmates upon the individual. Group-level outcomes have received much less attention. As a result, little is known concerning the degree to which the social stigma of being black is reinforced in desegregated schools. THe manner in which social race is responded to in the social order established in desegregated schools is also unknown. Sociometric and observational studies such as that of Kimball and black students was far greater than that for non-minority students. There are also a number of city-specific studies regarding pushouts, such as those of Clarke (1973) and Miller (1975). Clarke's study closely reanalyzed the findings of a New Orleans Parish Superintendent's Task Force on Suspensions for 1972. Clarke defined the extent of pushouts by a group-to-group comparison of suspensions, finding indications of what he considered blatant racism.

Recognition of pushouts as a desegregation-related problem has generated some organizational response. Miller (1975) for example, describes the Massachusetts Advocacy Center's School Desegregation Project which provides representation to individual students in administrative hearings to assure that they were accorded due process and to monitor student discipline practices during the implementation of the desegregation order.

(For an additional source see Yudof 1975; Demarest and Jordan 1975 present a detailed discussion of the legal aspects of suspensions.)

V. 5.c. Compensatory Education

Compensatory education programs burgeoned in the mid-sixties under the impetus of the theoretical notion of social and cultural deprivation of poor peoples in the United States. (See Section IV. 3.a. for a review of the literature delineating this concept.) This section identifies some of the principal literature on the kinds of programs developed under the compensatory education umbrella and subsequent responses to these programs.

The most comprehensive early review of the different kinds of compensatory education programs in the U.S. from pre-school through

Wagley(1974) suggest that in many desegregated schools black and white students tend to form separate activity systems and social networks. It is also evident from court cases on tracking and suspensions, that an inordinate number of black children wind up in lower tracks and are ejected from schools - suggesting the operation of certain stratification processes. E. Cohen (1972a,1975), one of the few researchers concerned with desegregated situations who has developed and refined the concept of stigmatization to any extent, has provided both laboratory data and a theoretical context which suggest that these social processes deserve attention. (See also Pettigrew 1975.)

A number of researchers have drawn attention to the importance of social processes in the structuring of learning in schools, although not particularly in desegregated schools. Willover, et al. (1973), for example, notes the connection between teachers' perceptions of the type of student body and the form of control or classroom management they employ. He suggests that the greater the perceived problem posed by the students, the more likely the teacher will be to impose custodial management on some student or on whole classrooms. In doing so the teacher is also responding to the feelings of the principal, other teachers, and the community concerning control procedures. Early studies which focused on academic standards as a measure of change resulting from desegregation, found that teachers' ideas about the academic standards of their schools were lowered after desegregation (see, for example, Wey and Corey 1959). Studies of expectations have shown that teachers do perceive certain groups of students more negatively than others and treat them differently see, for example, Rist 1973). Leacock (1969) reports that teachers of middle-income students tend to blame themselves when students perform poorly, while teachers of lower-class students blame the students. These findings suggest that black students may be exposed to management techniques which differ from those imposed on whites, with resulting differences in educational outcomes. (For a related study on the effects of different social situations on the handling of discipline problems, see Nicholas, Virgo, and Wattenberg 1965.)

Leacock suggests that the way in which the teacher structures student involvement will determine what is learned. Her suggestion is borne out by the work of Talbert (1970) and Rist (1973) who show how teachers can exclude children as participants in learning through interaction rates and seating arrangements. Leacock herself finds that the techniques used by some teachers implicitly reinforce stereotypes which the white society has traditionally applied to blacks.

The possibility of reestablishment of segregated patterns in the classroom and the social mechanisms which channel learning would seem to be appropriate questions for researchers interested in investigating the outcomes of desegregation and explaining differences in educational opportunities (outcomes). In some ways it seems curious that so little attention has been devoted to these areas. Clark (1973) has suggested that attention to explanations of educational outcomes for blacks in terms of depressed conditions rather than social stigmatization, has developed for political or social reasons. A more mundane reason might also be suggested. Certain research methodologies have tended to predominate in the study of desegregation outcomes and in the study of factors affecting educational outcomes. These methods of survey and testing suggest that the social and cultural context of desegregation is thoroughly understood and that the crucial variables have been identified or at least suggested by a theory. On the contrary, desegregation research has been characterized instead by a lack of basis either in theory on in grounded information on which to develop informed research questions. This lopsided perspective has included relatively few intensive studies and relatively little attention to theoretical frameworks.

VII. REFERENCES

Aarons, Alfred C., Barbara Y. Gordon, and William A. Stewart
1969 Linguistic-Cultural Differences and American Education. Special Anthropology Issue, The Florida FL Reporter 7(1). Miami: Florida FL Reporter. (V.5.d)

Abrams, Roger I.
1975 Not One Judge's Opinion: Morgan v. Hennigan and the Boston Schools. Harvard Educational Review 45(1):5-16. (III.1.c)

Adams, A. John, and Joan Martin Burke
1970 Civil Rights: A Current Guide to the People, Organizations, and Events. New York: R. R. Bowker Company. (III.3.)

An encyclopedia-like listing of civil rights leaders, and organizations and events 1955-1970. A 1974 edition originally prepared as a quick reference for CBS News, is also available.

Alabama Council on Human Relations
1972 It's Not Over in the South: School Desegregation in Forty-Three Southern Cities Eighteen Years After Brown. Washington, D.C.: Southern Education Foundation. (IV.1)

Alexander, C. N., Jr., and E. Q. Campbell
1964 Peer Influences on Adolescent Educational Aspirations and Attainments. American Sociological Review 29:568-75. (VI.3.a)

Alexander George J.
1963 Civil Rights, U.S.A. Public Schools - Cities in the North and West, 1963, Buffalo, ERIC: ED001942. (IV.1)

Altschuler, Alan A.
1970 Community Control: The Black Demand for Participation in Large American Cities. New York: Pegasus. (V.3)

Anastasi, Anne
1964 Culture-Fair Testing. Educational Horizons (43):26-30. (IV.3.c)

Armor, David J.
1972a The Evidence on Busing. The Public Interest 28:90-126. (V.1.c; VI.1.a; VI.3.b)

1972b School and Family Effects on Black and White Achievement: A Reexamination of the USOE Data. In On Equality of Educational Opportunity. F. Mosteller and D. P. Moynihan, Eds. New York: Random House. (VI.1.b; VI.2.a)

Arnez, Nancy L.
1973 Partners in Urban Education: Teaching the Inner-City Child. Morristown, N.J.: Silver Burdett Division, General Learning Corporation. (V.5.e)

Askew, Reubin O'D.
1972 Busing is Not the Issue. Inequality in Education 11(March):3-5. (V.1.c)

Ausubel, David P.
1964 How Reversible are the Cognitive and Motivational Effects of Cultural Deprivation? Implications for Teaching the Culturally Deprived Child. Urban Education 1(Summer):16-38. (IV.3.a)

Bachman, Gerald G.
1970 Youth in Transition, Volume 2. Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan. (VI.2.a)

Banaka, William H., et al.
1971 Training People in the Public Schools to Run Interracial Sensitivity Groups: A Graduate Program. Papers presented at Western Psychological Association Convention, San Francisco, CA. April, 1971. (V.5.e)

Banks, James A.
1972 The Destruction of Black Schools: An American Tragedy. Educational Leadership 30(3):269-71. (II.3.)

Banks, James A., Ed.
1973 Teaching Ethnic Studies: Concepts and Strategies. 43rd Yearbook, National Council for the Social Studies. Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies. (V.5.d)

Baratz, Joan C.
1975 Court Decisions and Educational Change: A Case History of the D. C. Public Schools, 1954-1974. In From Brown to Bradley: School Desegregation 1954-1974. R. Stephen Browning, Ed. Cincinnati: Jefferson Law Book Company. pp. 63-80. (V.5)

Baratz, Stephen S., and Joan C. Baratz
1970 Early Childhood Intervention: The Social Science Base of Institutional Racism. Harvard Educational Review 40(1):29-50. (IV.3.a; V.5.c)

Battle, Haron, J.
1973 State Involvement in the Urban Education Crisis. Journal of Negro Education 42(3):315-321. (V.1.d)

Bell, Derrick A., Jr.
1970 School Litigation Strategies for the 1970's: New Phases in the Continuing Quest for Quality Schools. Wisconsin Law Review 1970: 257-297. (II.3)

Bell describes the frustrations engendered among blacks using the courts as a primary means of securing quality education. He suggests alternatives to school desegregation such as demands for black control and establishment of private schools for black children now in inner-city schools.

1975a Running and Busing in Twentieth Century America. In From Brown to Bradley: School Desegregation 1954-1974. R. Stephen Browning, Ed. Cincinnati: Jefferson Law Book Co. pp. 214-217. (III.1.a)

1975b Waiting on the Promise of Brown. Law and Contemporary Problems 39(2):341-373. (II.3; III.1.a)

Written in the form of a response to a black community group desiring equal educational opportunity for their children, this article counsels that the community investigate alternatives. Extensive footnotes guide readers to cases wherein courts have ruled on the various resistance tactics (e.g., segregated private schools) and the legality of various alternatives such as community control.

Bernstein, Basil
1961 Social Class and Linguistic Development: A Theory of Social Learning. In Education, Economy and Society. A. H. Halsey, J. Floud, and C. A. Anderson, Eds. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, Inc. pp. 288-314. (IV.3.a)

Billings, Charles E.
1972 Community Control of the School and the Quest for Power. Phi Delta Kappan 53(5):277-278. (II.3)

Binderman, Murray B.
1972 The Failure of Freedom of Choice: Decision-Making in a Southern Black Community. Social Forces 50(4):487-498. (V.1.a)

Blaustein, Albert P., and Clarence Clyde Ferguson, Jr.
1954 Desegregation and the Law: The Meaning and Effect of the School Segregation Cases. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press. (III.1.b)

Bloom, Benjamin S., Allison David, and Robert Hess
1965 Compensatory Education for Cultural Deprivation. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc. (IV.3.a)

Brace, C. Loring, George Gamble, and Terry Bond, Eds.
1971 Race and Intelligence. Anthropological Studies, No. 8. Washington, DC: American Anthropological Association. (IV.3.b)

Braden, Anne
1958 The Wall Between. New York: Monthly Review Press. (V.2.a)

Brain, George B., et al.
1963 School Superintendents Conference on the Practical Problems of Public School Desegregation. Baltimore, MD: City Public Schools. (V.1)

Brigham, John C.
1974 Views of Black and White Children Concerning the Distribution of Personality Characteristics. Journal of Personality 42(1):145-158. (VI.2.b)

Brophy, Jere E., and Thomas L. Good
1970 Teachers' Communication of Differential Expectations for Children's Classroom Performance: Some Behavioral Data. Journal of Educational Psychology 61(5):365-374. (IV.3.c)

1974 Teacher-Student Relationships: Causes and Consequences. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc. (IV.3.c)

Brown, Cynthia, and Marlene Provizer
1972 The South's New Dual School System: a Case Study. New South 27(4):59-72. (V.2.b)

Bryson, Seymour, and John T. Mouw
1973 Race, Understanding, and Counseling. Integrated Education 11(4-5): 64-67. (V.5.e)

Burger, Henry G.
1968 "Ethno-Pedagogy"; a Manual in Cultural Sensitivity. With Techniques for Improving Cross-Cultural Teaching by Fitting Ethnic Patterns. Albuquerque: Southwestern Cooperative Educational Laboratory, Inc. (Publication No. 2-0768). (V.5.e)

Burnett, Jacquetta H.
1974 Anthropology and Education: An Annotated Bibliography Guide. Council on Anthropology and Education. New Haven: Human Relations Area Files. (I.2)

Burt, Lorin A., and S. Kern Alexander
1969 The Legal Status of the Neighborhood School. In Integration and Education. David W. Beggs and S. Kern Alexander, Eds. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company. pp. 107-120. (V.3)

Busk, Patricia L., R. C. Ford, and J. L. Schulman
1973 Effects of Schools' Racial Composition on the Self-Concept of Black and White Students. Journal of Educational Research 67(2):57-63. (VI.2.b)

Cahn, Edmond
1955 Jurisprudence. New York University Law Review 30(January):150-169. (III.4)

Caliguri, Joseph P.
1970 Suburban Interracial Education Projects. A Resource Booklet. Kansas City, MO: Missouri University, Office of Education. (V.5.e)

Camp, C. William, et al.
1969 Evaluation of the Portland-Suburban Transfer Program, 1968-69 Multnomah County, Oregon. Eugene, OR : Oregon University, Bureau of Educational Research. (V.1)

Campbell, Angus, and Shirley Hatchett
1976 Racial Attitude Trends: 1964-1974. Integrated Education 14(1): 40-42. (VI.3.a)

Campbell, E. Q.
1958 Some Social Psychological Correlates of Direction of Attitude Change. Social Forces 36:335-40. (VI.3.b)

Campbell, Roald F.
1967 Federal-State Educational Relations. Phi Delta Kappan 49(1):16-20. (III.2.c)

Campbell, Roald F., and Donald H. Layton
1968 Thrust and Counterthrust in Education Policy Making. Phi Delta Kappan 49(6);290-294. (III.2.c)

Carithers, Martha W.
1970 School Desegregation and Racial Cleavage, 1954-1970: A Review of the Literature. Journal of Social Issues 26(4):25-47. (VI.3.b)

Carter, Robert L.
1955 Legal Background and Significance of the May 17th Decision. Social Problems 2(4):215-219. (III.1.b)

Cazden, Courtney B., Vera P. John, and Dell Hymes, Eds.
1972 Functions of Language in the Classroom. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University. (IV.3.a)

Chachkin, Norman J.
1972 Metropolitan School Desegregation: Evolving Law. Integrated Education 10(2):13-26. (III.1.c)

Champagne, Anthony M.
1973 The Segregation Academy and the Law. Journal of Negro Education 42(1);58-66. (III.1.f)

Chesler, Mark
1967 "What Happened After You Desegregated the White School?" Atlanta Southern Regional Council, Inc. (V.2.a)

Chesler, Mark, and Phyllis Segal
1970 Southern Negroes' Initial Experiences and Reactions in School Desegregation. In Contemporary Issues in Educational Psychology. H. F. Clarizio, R. C. Craig, and W. A. Mehrens, Eds. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc. pp. 709-720. (VI.2.c; VI.3; VI.3.b)

Clark, Kenneth B.
1955 Prejudice and Your Child. Boston: Beacon Press. (VI.3.a)

1959 The Desegregation Cases: Criticism of the Social Scientist's Role. Villanova Law Review 5:224-226. (III.4)

Clark's response to critics of his role in Brown.

1962 Progress and Problems from the Social Scientist's Viewpoint. ERIC: ED014514. (IV.1)

1965 Dark Ghetto: Dilemmas of Social Power. New York: Harper and Row. (III.4)

Analysis of ghetto life based in part on Clark's years of study as chief project consultant and chairman of the board of directors of the planning stage of Harlem Youth Opportunities Unlimited.

1972a Eighteen Years After Brown. Integrated Education 10(6):7-15. (V.1; IV.1)

1972b Public School Desegregation in the Seventies. New South 27(3): 21-28. (IV.1)

1973 Social Policy, Power and Social Science Research. In Perspectives on Inequality. Harvard Educational Review, Ed. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Educational Review. (III.4; VI.4)

Clark, K. B., and M. P. Clark

1947 Racial Identification and Preference in Negro Children. In Readings in Social Psychology. T. M. Newcomb and E. L. Hartley, Eds. New York: Henry Holt. VI.2.b; VI.3.a; VI.3.b)

1950 Emotional Factors in Racial Identification and Preference in Negro Children. Journal of Negro Education 19:341-350. (VI)

Clark, Todd

1970 Integration, The First Year: A Role-Playing Simulation on School Integration. ERIC: ED050215. (V.5.e)

Clarke, Lillian W.

1973 Race and Suspensions in New Orleans. Integrated Education 11(3): 30-33. (V.5.b)

Cohen, Arthur R.

1968 Some Implications of Self-Esteem for Social Influence. In The Self in Social Interaction. C. Gordon and K. Gergen, Eds. New York: J. Wiley and Sons. pp. 383-390. (VI.2.b)

Cohen, David K.

1968 Policy for the Public Schools: Compensation and Integration. Harvard Educational Review 38(1):114-137. (II.2)

Utilizes existing research to assess the possible outsomes for alternative national policies on integration versus segregated compensatory education.

1969 The Price of Community Control. Commentary 48(1):23-32. (II.3; V.3)

1972 Compensatory Education. In Rethinking Urban Education. Herbert J. Walberg and Andrew T. Kopan, Eds. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc. pp. 150-164. (IV.3.a; V.5.c)

1974 Segregation, Desegregation, and Brown. Transaction: Social Science and Modern Society 12(1):34-41. (II.2; III.1.b; III.1.d)

Cohen, David K., and Michael S. Garet
1975 Reforming Educational Policy with Applied Social Research. Harvard Educational Review 45(1):17-43. (III.4)

An interpretation of the relationship between applied research and social policy using as case examples educational programs stimulated by the federal government.

Cohen, David K., T. F. Pettigrew, and R. T. Riley
1972 Race and the Outcomes of Schooling. *In* On Equality of Educational Opportunity. Frederick Mosteller and Daniel P. Moynihan, Eds. New York: Random House. (VI.1.a)

Cohen, Elizabeth G.
1972a Interracial Interaction Disability. Human Relations 25:9-24. (V.5; VI.4)

1972b Sociology and the Classroom: Setting the Conditions for Teacher Student Interaction. Review of Educational Research 42:441-452. (VI.3)

1975 The Effects of Desegregation on Race Relations. Law and Contemporary Problems 39(2):271-299. (VI.4)

Cole, Michael, and Silvia Scribner
1974 Culture and Thought: A Psychological Introduction. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc. (IV.3.a; IV.3.c)

Coleman, Andrew M.
1972 "Scientific" Racism and the Evidence on Race and Intelligence. Race 14(2):137-153. (IV.3.b)

Coleman, James S.
1968 The Concept of Equality of Educational Opportunity. Harvard Educational Review 38(1):7-22. (II.2)

Coleman traces the historical roots of the concept of equal educational opportunity and its evolution to the present.

1975 Racial Segregation in the Schools: New Research with Policy Implications. Phi Delta Kappan (Oct):75-78. (II.2; IV.1; V.1.d; V.2.d)

Summarizes research findings and policy recommendations he reported in *Trends in School Segregation, 1968-1973*; findings suggest that efforts to desegregate large urban districts may lead to increases in inter-district segregation; policy implications are considered.

1976 The Ways of Socialization. The Center Magazine 9(3):3-10. (IV.1; VI.3)

Coleman, James S., *et al.*
1966 Equality of Educational Opportunity. Washington, DC: U. S. Government Printing Office. (II.2; III.1.d; III.4; IV.1; IV.2; IV.3; V.3; VI.1; VI.1.a; VI.2.a; VI.2.b; VI.3.c)

Coleman, James S., S. P. Kelly, and J. Moore
n.d. Trends in School Segregation, 1968-1973. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute. (IV.1; V.2.c)

Coles, Robert
1963 The Desegregation of Southern Schools: A Psychiatric Study. *In* Integration vs. Segregation. Hubert A. Humphrey, Ed. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company. pp. 201-229. (VI.2.b)

1967 Children of Crisis: A Study of Courage and Fear. Boston: Little, Brown. (V.2.a; VI.2.b; VI.2.c; VI.3)

Conant, James B.
1961 Slums and Suburbs: A Commentary on Schools in Metropolitan Areas. New York: New American Library. (III.4)

Depicts educational problems in city schools as contrasted with those in suburban schools. Attributes difficulties to the influx of low-income, poorly educated blacks into schools the resources of which were dwindling.

Congress of Racial Equality
1973 A Proposal for Community School Districts. *In* The Great School Bus Controversy. Nicolaus Mills, Ed. New York: Teachers College Press. (II.3)

Coons, J., W. Clune, and S. Sugarman
1970 Private Wealth and Public Education. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press. (III.1.c; III.1.d)

Crain, Robert L.
1968 The Politics of School Desegregation: Comparative Case Studies of Community Structure and Policy-Making. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company. (V.2.a; VI.3.b)

1971 School Integration and the Academic Achievement of Negroes. Sociology of Education 44:1-26. (VI.1.b)

Crain, Robert L., Ed.
1973 Southern Schools: An Evaluation of the Effects of the Emergency School Assistance Program and of School Desegregation. Volume I. Chicago: National Opinion Research Center. (III.2.c; VI.3.c)

Craven, J. Braxton, Jr.
1975 The Impact of Social Science Evidence on the Judge: A Personal Comment. Law and Contemporary Problems 39(1):150-157. (III.4)

Reviews the use of social science data in court cases and his opinion of the benefits and detriments of using such data.

Criswell, J. H., Jr.
1937 Racial Cleavage in Negro-White Groups. Sociometry 1:81-89. (VI.3.a)

Crockett, Harry J.
1957 A Study of Some Factors Affecting the Decision of Negro High School Students to Enroll in Previously All-White High Schools, St. Louis, 1955. Social Forces 35(4):351-356. (V.1.a; VI.3.a)

Cusick, Philip A., and Richard J. Ayling
1974 Biracial Interaction in an Urban Secondary School. School Review 82(3): 436-494. (VI.3.c)

Daheim, David
1965 Intergroup Education. Seattle Public Schools, Seattle, WA: Seattle Public Schools. (V.5.d)

Darkenwald, Gordon G.
1975 Some Effects of the ' Obvious Variable': Teacher's Race and Holding Power with Black Adult Students. Sociology of Education 48:420-431. (V.4.b; VI.3.b)

Davey, A. G.
1973 Teachers, Race, and Intelligence. Race 15(2):195-211. (IV.3.b)

Day, Richard, E., et al.
1963 Civil Rights, U.S.A. Public Schools - Southern States, 1963 North Carolina. ERIC: ED001930. (V; V.1.a)

This discusses the Pupil Assignment Act, which transferred authority of pupil assignment to local school boards, and the Pearsall Plan, which provided "safety valves" to assure escape possibilities for intolerable situations in school segregation. Both of these plans were used in North Carolina.

De'Ath, Colin, Michael Gibbons, and Ernest O'Neil
1969 Black Education and Black Society in the United States: A Bibliography for Development Educators. Occasional Paper. Pittsburgh, PA: International and Development Education Program, School of Education, University of Pittsburgh. (I.2)

Demarest, Sylvia M., and John F. Jordan
1975 Hawkins v. Coleman: Discriminatory Suspensions and the Effect of Institutional Racism on School Discipline. Inequality in Education 20(July):25-41. (V.5.b)

Denmark, Florence L.
1970 The Effects of Integration on Academic Achievement and Self-Concept. Integrated Education 8:34-42. (VI.1.a; VI.2.b)

Dentler, Robert A.
1965 Community Behavior and Northern School Desegregation. Journal of Negro Education 34(3):258-267. (V.2.a)

Dentler, R. A., and C. Elkins
1967 Intergroup Attitudes, Academic Performance, and Racial Composition. In The Urban R's. R. A. Dentler, B. Mackler, and M. E. Warshauer, Eds. New York: Frederick A Praeger. (VI.3)

Deutsch, Cynthia P.
1967 Auditory Discrimination and Learning: Social Factors. In The Disadvantaged Child: Selected Papers of Martin Deutsch and Associates. M. Deutsch, Ed. New York: Basic Books, Inc. pp. 259-277. (IV.3.a)

Deutsch, Martin P.
1967a Dimensions of the School's Role in the Problems of Integration. In The Disadvantaged Child. M. Deutsch, Ed. New York: Basic Books, Inc. pp. 281-294. (V.5)

1967b The Disadvantaged Child and the Learning Process. In The Disadvantaged Child: Selected Papers of Martin Deutsch and Associates. M. Deutsch, Ed. New York: Basic Books, Inc. pp. 39-57. (IV.3.a)

Deutsch, Martin P., and B. Brown
1964 Social Influence in Negro-White Intelligence Differences. Journal of Social Issues 20(2):24-35. (IV.3.a)

Dewing, Rolland
1968 Teacher Organizations and Desegregation. Phi Delta Kappan 49(5): 257-260. (V.4.b)

Dillard, J. L.
1973 Black English: Its History and Usage in the United States. New York: Vintage Books. (V.5.d)

Dodson, Dan W.
1965 School Administration, Control and Public Policy Concerning Integration. Journal of Negro Education 34(3):249-257. (V.3)

Durham, Joseph T.
1973 Sense and Nonsense About Busing. Journal of Negro Education 42(3):322-335. (V.1.c)

Dwyer, Robert J.
1958 A Report on Patterns of Interaction in Desegregated Schools. Journal of Educational Sociology 31(7):253-256. (VI.3.c)

Eddy, Elizabeth M.
1967 Walk the White Line. Garden City, NJ: Doubleday and Company Inc. (VI.3)

1975 Educational Innovation and Desegregation: A Case Study of Symbolic Realignment. Human Organization 34(2):163-172. (V.5; V.5.e)

Edmonds, Ronald
1973 Judicial Assumptions on the Value of Integrated Education for Blacks. In Race, Racism and American Law. D. Bell, Jr., Ed. Boston: Little, Brown and Company. (II.2)

Edmonds, Ronald, *et al.*
1973 A Black Response to Christopher Jenck's Inequality and Certain Other Issues. *In* Perspectives on Inequality. Harvard Educational Review, Ed. Cambrigde, MA: Harvard Educational Review. (III.4)

Egerton, John
1967 When Desegregation Comes, The Negro Principals Go. Southern Education Report 3(5):8-12. (V.4.b)

Eidenberg, Eugene, and Roy D. Morey
1969 An Act of Congress: The Legislative Process and the Making of Education Policy. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, Inc. (III.2.c)

Details events preceding the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, and its subsequent modifications in 1966 and 1967. The controversy over federal aid to education prior to 1965 is also analyzed in terms of policy development processes.

Elkind, D.
1969 Preschool Education. Childhood Education 45:321-328. (V.5.c)

Epps, Edgar C.
1975 The Impact of School Desegregation on Aspirations, Self-Concepts and Other Aspects of Personality. Law and Contemporary Problems 39(2): 300-313. (VI.2; VI.2.b)

Erickson, Frederick
1975 Gatekeeping and the Melting Pot: Interaction in Counseling Encounters. Harvard Educational Review 45(1):44-70. (VI.3.b)

Falk, William W., and A. G. Cosby
1974 School Desegregation and the Educational Projections of Rural Black Youth. Rural Sociology 39(1): 28-41. (VI.2.a)

Farley, Reynolds
1976 Is Coleman Right? Social Policy 6(4):14-23. (IV.1; V.2.c)

Feagin, Joe R.
1971 White Separatists and Black Separatists: A Comparative Analysis. Social Problems 19(2):167-180. (II.4)

Discussion of historical and contemporary models of the preferred goals of interethnic and interrace adjustment, focusing on separatist models. Contains references to classical historical treatment of black-white relations in the United States and the related movements which arose. Feagin analyzes 1968 data to ascertain degree of support for separatist models among blacks and whites.

Feldstein, Sylvan, and Bernard Mackler
1969 De Facto School Segregation in the North: The Case of "In re Skipwith". Howard Law Journal 15(3):382-421. (III.1.c)

Fielder, Marie, and Louise M. Dyckman
1967 Leadership Training Institute in Problems of School Desegregation. Berkeley: University of California, Office of Education. (V.5.e)

Finn, Jeremy D.
1972 Expectations and the Educational Environment. Review of Educational Research 42(3):387-410. (IV.3.c)

Fischer, John H.
1964 Can Administrators Justify Neighborhood Schools - If Those Schools Have the Effect of Creating or Continuing Segregation? Nation's Schools 73(2):46-47, 86. (V.3)

1967 The School Park. *In* Educational Parks, U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, Clearinghouse Publication No. 9. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office. (V.1.b)

Flannery, J. Harold
1972 School Desegregation Law: Recent Developments. Integrated Education 10(3):11-19. (III.1.c; III.1.e)

Fleming, E. and R. Anttonen
1971 Teacher Expectancy as Related to the Academic and Personal Growth of Primary-Age Children. Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development 35(5 Serial No. 145). (IV.3.c)

Forbes, Jack D.
n.d. Afro-Americans in the Far West: A Handbook for Educators. Berkeley, CA: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development. (V.5.e)

Fort, J. G., J. C. Watts, and G. S. Lesser
1969 Cultural Background and Learning in Young Children. Phi Delta Kappan 50:386-88. (IV.3.a)

Foster, G. W., Jr.
1965 Title VI: Southern Education Faces the Facts. Saturday Review 48(March 20):60-61, 76-79. (III.2.b)

Fox, David J.
1966 Free Choice Open Enrollment - Elementary Schools. New York: Center for Urban Education. (VI.3.c)

Frenk, James H.
1973 The Influence of Non-White Pupil Classroom Composition on Classroom Quality. ERIC:ED 080629. (VI.3.c)

Fuchs, Estelle
1969 Teacher's Talk: Views From Inside City Schools. New York: Doubleday. (IV.3.a; IV.3.d; VI.3)

Gallimore, Ronald, *et al.*
1974 Culture, Behavior, and Education. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, Inc. (IV.3.d)

Gardner, Burleigh B., et al.
1970 The Effect of Busing Black Ghetto Children into White Suburban Schools. ERIC: ED048389. (VI.3.b)

Gay, Geneva
1974 Differential Dyadic Interactions of Black and White Teachers with Black and White Pupils in Recently Desegregated Social Studies Classrooms: A Function of Teacher and Pupil Ethnicity. Final Report. ERIC: ED091489. (VI.3.c)

Gibson, Morgan, et al.
1963 De Facto School Segregation in Milwaukee. Milwaukee: National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. (IV.1)

Giles, Raymond H., Jr.
1974 Black Studies Programs in Public Schools. Praeger Special Studies in U. S. Economic, Social, and Political Issues. New York: Praeger Publishers. (V.5.d)

Examines the operation of various ethnic and black studies programs and their impact on racial attitudes. Includes data on elementary students' attitudes toward Africa after an African heritage program and a description and critique of representative case studies drawn from a survey of Afro-American studies programs throughout the country. An analysis of curriculum guides from 16 school districts identifies three distinct orientations to teaching black studies. Giles delineates criticisms of each of these approaches. For example, he is critical of ethnic studies used as a therapeutic alternative to reduce racial tension in place of needed examination of the motives and dynamics of the behaviors of certain white groups who have practiced racism with utmost effectiveness.

Gittell, Marilyn, and Alan G. Hevesi, Eds.
1969 The Politics of Urban Education. New York: Praeger Publishers. (V.1.d)

Glazer, Nathan
1974 Strategies for Integration: II, On "Opening Up" the Suburbs. Public Interest 37(Fall):89-111. (III.4; V.1.d)

Goldberg, Miriam L., A. Harry Passow, and Joseph Justman
1966 The Effects of Ability Grouping. New York: Teachers College Press. (V.5.a)

Goodman, Mary
1964 Racial Awareness in Young Children. New York: Collier Books. (VI.2.b; VI.3.a; VI.3.b)

Goodman, Thomas L.
1968 The Need for School Lobbyists. Phi Delta Kappan 49(6):340-341. (V.4.a)

Gordon, Edmund W., and Doxey A. Wilkerson
1966 Compensatory Education for the Disadvantaged. New York: College Entrance Examination Board. (IV.3.a; V.5.c)

Gottlieb, David, and Warren D. TenHouten
1965 Racial Compositon and the Social System of Three High Schools. Journal of Marriage and the Family 27:204-12. (VI.3.b; VI.3.c)

Green, James A., and Harold B. Gerard
1974 School Desegregation and Ethnic Attitudes. In Integrating the Organization: A Social Psychological Analysis. H. L. Fromkin and J. J. Sherwood, Eds. New York: The Free Press. pp. 291-311. (VI.3.b)

Green, Robert L.
1973 Community Control and Desegregation. School Review 81(3):347-356. (V.5.a)

Green, Robert L., and T. F. Pettigrew
1976 Urban Desegregation and White Flight: A Response to Coleman. Phi Delta Kappan (Feb):399-402. (IV.1; V.2.c)

Green, Robert L., Eugenia Smith, and John H. Schweitzer
1972 Busing and the Multiracial Classroom. Phi Delta Kappan 53(9): 543-546. (V.1.c)

Groff, Patrick J.
1962 Teacher Organizations and School Desegregation. School and Society 90(2218):441-442. (V.4.b)

Guthrie, James W., George B. Kleindorfer, Henry M. Levin, and Robert T. Stout
1971 Schools and Inequality. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press. (III.4)

Guthrie, James W., and Paula H. Skene
1973 The Escalation of Pedagogical Politics. Phi Delta Kappan 54(6): 386-389. (V.4.a)

Hall, John A., and H. V. Wiant
1973 Does School Desegregation Change Occupational Goals of Negro Males? Journal of Vocational Behavior 3(2): 175-179. (VI.2.a)

Haller, Elizabeth S.
1970 Minority History: What? Why? How? Harrisburg: Pennsylvania State Department of Public Instruction, Bureau of General and Academic Education. (V.5.d)

Hamilton, Charles
1968 Race and Education: A Search for Legitimacy. Harvard Educational Review 38(4):669-684. (II.3)

Argues that the concept of educational improvement held by black parents has gone beyond the experts' focus on achievement in verbal and mathematical skills. Black people want community control, not integration. They are just as interested in Afro-American culture as verbal and arithmetic skills.

Hanushek, Eric A.
1972 Education and Race: An Analysis of the Educational Production Process. Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath and Company. (VI.1.a; VI.1.b)

Harris, Marvin
1975 Culture, People, and Nature, Second Edition. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell and Company. (II.2; IV.3.a)

Harvard Educational Review
1969 Equal Educational Opportunity. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. (IV.2)

Harvey, James C., and Charles H. Holmes
1972 Busing and School Desegregation. Phi Delta Kappan 53(9):540-542. (V.1.c)

Hendrick, Clyde, and Donna K. Rumenik
1973 Race versus Belief about Race as Determinants of Attraction: Belief Prejudices and Two Kinds of Race Prejudice. Journal of Research in Personality 7(2):148-164. (VI.3.c)

Hendrick, Irving, G.
1968 The Development of a School Integration Plan in Riverside, California: A History and Perspective. Riverside, CA: University of California. (Report No. RSS-SMP-M7-14) (V.1)

Hermalin, Albert I., and Reynolds Farley
1973 The Potential for Residential Integration in Cities and Suburbs: Implications for the Busing Controversy. American Sociological Review 38(5):595-610. (V.1.c)

Herman, Barry
1970 Interracial Attitudes Among 175 Sixth Grade Students. Curriculum Leadership 9:30-35. (VI.3.b)

Hillson, Maurie, Francesco Cordasco, and Francis P. Purcell
1969 Education and the Urban Community. New York: American Book Company. (III.2.c)

Hope, John,III., Ed.
1975 Twenty Years After Brown: Equality of Educational Opportunity. A Report of the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, March 1975. Washington, DC: Commission on Civil Rights. (IV.1)

Howe, Harold, III, et al.
1970 Racism and American Education: A Dialogue and Agenda for Action. New York: Harper and Row. (II)

A conference convened of well-known scholars and educators to discuss plans for altering racism in American education. Participants included Harold Howe, Kenneth Clark, James Allen, Lisle Carter, Eric Erickson, Milton Galimison and others.

Humphrey, Hubert H., Ed.
1964 Integration vs. Segregation. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company. (II.1)

Included in this volume is "The Southern Manifesto," a statement presented to Congress in 1956 by a group of 101 senators and representatives from eleven southern states.

Hyman, Jacob D., and Wade J. Newhouse
1964 Desegregation of the Schools: the Present Legal Situation. Urban Education 1(1):46-73. (III.1.c)

Irvine, LaVerne, and Norman R. Brierley
1973 Problem Solving in Resolving Problems Relating to School Desegregation. College Student Journal 7(3):68-72. (V.5.e)

Irwin, Orvis C.
1948 Infant Speech: The Effect of Family Occupational Status and of Age on Use of Sound Types. Journal of Speech and Hearing Disorders 13(September):224-226. (IV.3.a)

Jencks, Christopher S., and M. Brown
1975 The Effects of Desegregation on Student Achievement: Some New Evidence from the Equality of Educational Opportunity Survey. Sociology of Education 48:126-140. (VI.1.a)

Jencks, Christopher S., *et al*.
1972 Inequality: A Reassessment of the Effects of Family and Schooling in America. New York: Basic Book, Inc. (II.2; III.1.d; III.4; IV.2; IV.3; VI.1.b)

Jensen, Arthur R.
1968 Social Class, Race and Genetics: Implications for Education. American Educational Research Journal 5:1-42. (IV.3.a)

1969 How Much Can We Boost IQ and Scholastic Achievement? Harvard Educational Review 39(1):1-123. (III.4; IV.3; IV.3.b)

1973 The Differences are Real. Psychology Today 7(7):80-86. (IV.3.b)

Johnson, James A., Jr., Ed.
1973 On the Interface Between Low-Income, Urban Black Children and Their Teachers During the Early School Years: A Position Paper. Report. San Francisco, CA: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development. (IV.3.d)

Johnson, John L.
1969 Special Education and the Inner City: A Challenge for the Future or Another Means for Cooling the Mark Out? Journal of Special Education 3(3):241-251. (V.5.a)

Kaplan, Sidney J., and A. Lee Coleman
1963 The Strategy of Change: Contrasting Approaches to Teacher Integration. Social Science (October):218-221. (V.5.e)

Katz, Irwin

1967a The Socialization of Academic Motivation in Minority Group Children. In Nebraska Symposium on Motivation, Vol. 15. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press. (VI.2.a; VI.2.c)

1967b Some Motivational Determinants of Racial Differences in Intellectual Achievement. International Journal of Psychology 2 (1):1-12. (IV.3.a)

Katz, Irwin, and L. Benjamin

1960 Effects of White Authoritarianism in Biracial Work Groups. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology 61:448-456. (V.5; VI.3.c)

Keddie, Nell, Ed.

1973 Tinker Tailor...The Myth of Cultural Deprivation. Middlesex, England: Penguin Books, Ltd. (IV.3.a)

Keppel, Francis

1967 Educational Technology and the Educational Park. In Educational Parks. U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Clearinghouse Publication No. 9 Washington, D C: U.S. Government Printing Office. (V.1.b)

Killian, Lewis M., and Charles M. Crigg

1965 Community Resistance to and Acceptance of Desegregation. Journal of Negro Education 34(3):268-277. (V.2.a)

Kimball, Solon T., and Charles Wagley

1974 Race and Culture in School and Community. Final Report. ERIC: ED091489. (VI.3; VI.3.c; VI.4)

King, Charles E., and Robert R. Mayer

1972 The Exercise of Community Leadership for School Desegregation. Urban Education 7(3):215-234. (V.4.a; VI.3.c)

Kirby, David J., and Robert L. Crain

1974 The Functions of Conflict: School Desegregation in 91 Cities. Social Science Quarterly 55(2):478-492. (V.2.a; V.4.a)

Kirby, David J., T. Robert Harris, and Robert L. Crain

1973 Political Strategies in Northern School Desegregation. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books. (V.2.a)

Kirp, David L.

1970 Community Control, Public Policy, and the Limits of the Law. Michigan Law Review 68: 1355-1388. (V.3)

1973 Judicial Policy-Making: Inequitable Public School Financing and the Serrano Case (1971). In Politics in America. A. Sindler, Ed. pp. 82-123. (III.1.d)

Kirp, David L., and Mark G. Yudof
1974 Educational Policy and the Law: Cases and Materials. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Co. (III.1.a; III.1.e; III.1.f; III.4)

A useful book which describes important cases affecting education and includes synopses and quotes of published analyses of the impact of the law on educational policy.

Klopf, Gordon J., and Garda W. Bowman
1966 Teacher Education in a Social Context: A Study of the Preparation of School Personnel for Working with Disadvantaged Children and Youth. New York: Mental Health Materials Center, Inc., for Bank Street College of Education. (V.5.e)

Koslin, Sandra, B. Koslin, R. Parament, and H. Waxman
1972 Classroom Racial Balance and Students' Interracial Attitudes. Sociology of Education 45:386-407. (VI.3.b; VI.3.c)

Krovetz, Martin L.
1972 Desegregation or Integration: Which is Our Goal? Phi Delta Kappan 54(4):247-249. (II.2)

Krystall, Eric, M.A. Chesler, and A. E. White
1967 Voting Behavior and Attitudes Toward School Desegregation: A Study of Southern Negroes. Tuskeegie, AL: Department of Social Science Research, Tuskeegie Institute. (VI.2.a)

Labov, William
1970 The Logic of Nonstandard English. In Language and Poverty: Perspectives on a Theme. Frederick Williams, Ed. Chicago: Markham Publishing Company. pp. 153-189. (IV.3.a)

Lacey, C.
1966 Some Sociological Concomitants of Academic Streaming in a Grammar School. British Journal of Sociology (September):245-262. (V.5.a)

Lamanna, Richard A.
1965 The Negro Teacher and Desegregation: A Study of Strategic Decision Makers and their Vested Interests in Different Community Contexts. Sociological Inquiry 26-40. (V.4.b)

Law and Contemporary Problems
1975 The Courts, Social Science, and School Desegregation: Parts I and II 39(2). Durham, N C: Duke University, School of Law. (VI)

Brings together articles by a number of individuals who have contributed a great deal to the literature on school desegregation; the articles review legal, policy, and research issues prominent in the evolution of the conceptualizations of desegregation.

Leacock, Eleanor B.
1969 Teaching and Learning in City Schools: A Comparative Study. New York: Basic Books. (IV.3.a; VI.3; VI.4)

Leacock, Eleanor, Martin Deutsch, and Joshua A. Fishman
1959 The Bridgeview Study: A Preliminary Report. Journal of Social Issues 15(4):30-37. (V.2.c)

Leeson, Jim
1966 Private Schools Continue to Increase in the South. Southern Education Report 2(4):22-25. (V.2.b)

1967 Private Schools for Whites Face Some Hurdles. Southern Education Report 3(4):13-17. (V.2.b)

Lesser, G., G. Fifer, and D. Clark
1965 Mental Abilities of Children from Different Social-Class and Cultural Groups. Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, Serial No. 102,30(4). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. (IV.3.a)

Levin, Betsy, and Philip Moise
1975 School Desegregation Litigation in the Seventies and the Use of Social Science Evidence: An Annotated Guide. Law and Contemporary Problems 39(1):50-135. (III.1.a; III.1.b; III.1.c; III.1.e; III.4)

Levin, Henry M.
1974 Effects of Expenditure Increases on Educational Resource Allocation and Effectiveness. In School Finance in Transition: The Courts and Educational Reform. John Pincus, Ed. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger Publishing Company. pp. 177-198. (III.1.d)

Levine, Daniel V.
1969 The Segregated Society: What Must Be Done. Phi Delta Kappan 50(5):264-269. (II.2)

1973 Integration in Metropolitan Schools: Issues and Prospects. Phi Delta Kappan 54(10):651-657. (V.1.d)

Levine, David V., and Kenneth R. Mares
1970 Problems and Perceptions in a Desegregated Urban High School: A Case Description and Its Implications. Kansas City, MO: Missouri University, Center for the Study of Metropolitan Problems in Education. (V.5.e)

Lewis, Ralph, and Nancy H. St. John
1974 Contribution of Cross-Racial Friendship to Minority Group Achievement in Desegregated Classrooms. Sociometry 37:79-91. (VI.3.b)

Light, Richard J., and Paul V. Smith
1969 Social Allocation Models of Intelligence: A Methodological Inquiry. Harvard Educational Review 39(3):484-510. (IV.3.b)

Long, Herman H.
1955 The Challenge of Desegregation to Southern Social Scientists and Educators. Social Problems 2(4):204-207. (III.4)

Lowe, Joseph M.
1973 Improving Interpersonal Relationships Among Senior High School Students in a Recently Desegregated School. Office of Education ERIC: ED082081. (V.5.e)

Mahan, Thomas W., and A.M. Mahan
1971 The Impact of Schools on Learning: Inner City Children in Suburban Schools. Journal of School Psychology 9(1)1-11. (VI.2.c)

Mathews, John
1975 Busing is Stopped at the City Line. *In* From Brown to Bradley: School Desegregation 1954-1974. R. Stephen Browning, Ed. Cincinnati: Jefferson Law Book Company. pp. 199-202. (V.1.c)

Mayer, Robert, *et al*.
1974 The Impact of School Desegregation in a Southern City. Boston: D.C. Heath and Company. (VI.1.a)

McAdams, John D.
1974 Strategies for Integration: I, Can Open Enrollment Work? The Public Interest 37(Fall):69-88. (V.1.a)

McDonald, Marjorie
1970 Not by the Color of Their Skin: The Impact of Racial Differences on the Child's Development. New York: International Universities Press, Inc. (VI.2.b)

McDowell, Sophia F.
1967 Prejudices and Other Interracial Attitudes of Negro Youth. Final Report. ERIC: ED019390. (VI.3.b)

McPartland, James
1968 The Segregated Student in Desegregated Schools: Sources of Influence on Negro Secondary Students. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University, Center for the Study of Social Organization of School. (VI.2.b; VI.3.b)

Meranto, Philip
1967 The Politics of Federal Aid to Education in 1965: A Study in Political Innovation. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press. (III.2.c)

Mercer, Jane R.
1974 A Policy Statement on Assessment Procedures and the Rights of Children. Harvard Educational Review 44(1):125-141. (IV.3.c)

Miller, Joyce D.
1975 Student Suspensions in Boston: Derailing Desegregation. Inequality in Education 20(July):16-24. (V.5.b)

Mills, Nicolaus, Ed.
1973 The Great School Bus Controversy. New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University. (V.1.c)

Minnesota State Board of Education
1971 Guidelines Relating to Equality of Educational Opportunity and Desegregation, Intra-Cultural Quality Education. Integrated Education 9(6):51-53. (V.5)

Contains motivation for desegregation (denial of equal educational opportunity and promoting of prejudice and racism) and definitions.

Mizell, Mo Hayes
1968 A Divisive Issue: Freedom of Choice. Southern Education Report 3(6):18-21. (V.1.a)

Mosteller, Frederick, and Daniel P. Moynihan Eds.
1972 On Equality of Educational Opportunity. New York: Random House. (II.2; IV.1; IV.2; IV.3)

Moynihan, Daniel P.
1969 Sources of Resistance to the Coleman Report. In Equal Educational Opportunity. James S. Coleman, et al., Eds. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. pp. 25-38. (III.4; IV.2; IV.3)

Mumford, Luther
1973 White Flight From Desegregation in Mississippi. Integrated Education 11(3):12-26. (V.2.c)

Myers, Miles
1966 The Role of the AFT in School Desegregation. Changing Education 1(3):39-45. (V.4.b)

Myrdal, Gunnar
1944 An American Dilemma: The Negro Problem and Modern Democracy. New York: Harper and Brothers. (II.2)

Nash, Kermit
1968 Mental Health in the Desegregated School. Integrated Education 30:28-36. (VI.2.c)

NAACP Legal Defense and Education Fund
1971 An Even Chance. Washington, D C: NAACP Legal Defense and Education Fund. (III.2.c; III.3)

Evaluation of federally sponsored Indian education programs for compliance with authorization requirements.

NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund
1973 It's Not the Distance, "It's the Niggers." In The Great School Bus Controversy. Nicolaus Mills, Ed. New York: Teachers College Press. (II.1; V.1.c)

National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children
1967 Title I-ESEA: A Review and a Forward Look. Washington, D C: U.S. Government Printing Office. (III.2.c)

Compliance evaluation of programs supported by grants-in-aid authorized by Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

National Commission on Professional Rights and Responsibilities of the National Education Association
1965 Report on Task Force Survey of Teacher Displacement in Seventeen States. Washington, D C: U.S. Government Printing Office. (V.4.b)

National School Public Relations Association
1970 Black Studies in Schools. Education U.S.A. Special Report. Washington, D C: National School Public Relations Association. (V.5.d)

New York City Board of Education
1968 Teaching About Minorities in Classroom Situations: Resource Bulletin for Teachers in the Secondary Schools. Curriculum Bulletin, 1967-68 Series, No. 23. Brooklyn: New York City Board of Education, Bureau of Curriculum Development. (V.5.d)

Nicholas, Lynn N., S. Virgo, and William W. Wattenberg
1965 Effects of Socio-economic Settings and Organizational Climate on Problems Brought to Elementary School Offices. Final Report of Cooperative Research Project N2394. Detroit: Wayne State University, College of Education. (VI.4)

Noar, Gertrude
1966 The Teacher and Integration. Washington, D C: National Education Association. (V.5.e)

Ogbu, John
n.d. Manuscript on cross-cultural analysis of minority education. To be published by Academic Press, New York. (II.4)

Oklahoma State Department of Education

1971 A Curriculum Guide for Human Relations Education in Oklahoma Schools. Oklahoma City: Oklahoma Curriculum Improvement Commission. (V.5.e)

O'Reilly, Robert P.

1970 Social Class and Ethnic Status: Relationship to Intellectual and Educational Development and Related Factors. In Racial and Social Class Isolation in the Schools: Implications for Educational Policy and Programs. Robert P. O'Reilly, Ed. New York: Praeger Publishers. pp. 94-137. (VI.2.c)

Orfield, Gary

1969a The Politics of Resegregation. Saturday Review (September 20): 58-60, 77-79. (III.1.b; III.2.b; V.1)

1969b The Reconstruction of Southern Education: The Schools and the 1964 Civil Rights Act. New York: Wiley-Interscience. (II.1; III.1.a; III.1.b; III.1.f; III.2.a; III.2.b; V.1.a; V.2.a)

A detailed, careful account of the actors, groups, and events of importance leading up to the passage and enforcement of the 1964 Civil Rights Act.

1975 Congress, the President, and Anti-Busing Legislation, 1966-1974. In From Brown to Bradley: School Desegregation 1954-1974. R. Stephen Browning, Ed. Cincinnati: Jefferson Law Book Company. (II.1; III.1.b; III.2.a; III.2.b; III.2.c; V.1.c)

Describes the role of Congress in desegregation during the Johnson and Nixon administrations. Primary focus is given to the anti-busing legislation proposals.

1976 Response to Is Coleman Right. Richard Farley. Social Policy 6(4):24-29. (V.2.c)

Ornstein, Allan C.

1974 Race and Politics in School/Community Organizations. Pacific Palisades, CA: Goodyear Publishing Company. (V.1; V.1.d)

Osser, Harry

1973 Biological and Social Factors in Language Development. In Advances in Communication Research. C. David Mortensen and Kenneth K. Sereno, Eds. New York: Harper and Row. pp. 376-387. (IV.3.a)

Ozmon, Howard A.

1965 The Right of the Negro Teachers. American School Board Journal 13-14. (V.4.b)

Palmer, James M.
1971 Resegregation and the Private School Movement. Integrated Education 9(3):5-10. (V.2.b)

Payne, James S., Cecil D. Mercer, Ruth A. Payne, and Roxana G. Davison
1973 Head Start: A Tragicomedy with Epilogue. New York: Behavioral Publications. (V.5.c)

Peltason, Jack
1961 Fifty-Eight Lonely Men. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World. (III.1.a; III.1.b)

Peterson, John H., Jr.
1975 Black-White Joking Relationships Among Newly-Integrated Faculty. Integrated Education 13(1):33-37. (V.5.e)

Pettigrew, Thomas F.
1964 Negro American Intelligence: A New Look at an Old Controversy. Journal of Negro Education 33(1):6-25. (IV.3.b)

1969a The Negro and Education: Problems and Proposals. In Race and the Social Sciences. Irwin Katz and Patricia Gurin, Eds. New York: Basic Books, Inc. (VI.2.b)

1969b Race and Equal Educational Opportunity. In Equal Educational Opportunity. Harvard Educational Review, Eds. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. pp. 69-79. (II.2; VI; VI.3)

1972 Public Policy and Desegregation Research. Integrated Education 10(1):18-22. (III.4)

1975 The Cold Structural Inducements to Integration. Urban Review 8:137-144. (V.4.b; VI.4)

Pettigrew, Thomas F., Elizabeth L. Useem, Clarence Normand, and Marshall S. Smith
1973 Busing: A Review of "The Evidence." Public Interest 30 (Winter):88-118. (V.1.c; VI.1.a)

Pettigrew, Thomas F. and M. Richard Cramer
1959 The Demography of Desegregation. Journal of Social Issues 15 (4):61-71. (V.2.c)

Pincus, John, Ed.
1974 School Finance in Transition: The Courts and Educational Reform. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger Publishing Company. (III.1.d)

Porter, Judith D.R.
1971 Black Child, White Child: The Development of Racial Attitudes. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. (VI.3.a; VI.3.b)

Pringle, M.L. Kellmer, and Margaret Tanner
1958 The Effects of Early Deprivation on Speech Development: A Comparative Study of Four Year Olds in a Nursery School and in Residential Nurseries. Language and Speech 1(October-December): 269-287. (IV.3.a)

Proshansky, Harold, and Peggy Newton
1968 The Nature and Meaning of Negro Self-Identity. In Social Class, Race, and Psychological Development. Deutsch, Katz, and Jensen, Eds. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston. pp. 178-218. (VI.2.b; VI.3.a)

Read, Frank T.
1975 Judicial Evolution of the Law of School Integration Since Brown v. Board of Education. Law and Contemporary Problems 39 (1):7-50. (III.1.a; III.1.b; III.1.c)

Redisch, Ann, and Theodore A. Weissbach
1974 Traits Attributions by White Students to Black Fellow Students Versus Blacks in General, Journal of Social Psychology 92(1): 147-148. (VI.2.b)

Riccio, Anthony C., and K.D. Barnes
1973 Counselor Preferences of Senior High School Students. Counselor Education and Supervision 13(1):36-40. (VI.3.b)

Riessman, Frank
1962 The Culturally Deprived Child. New York: Harper and Row. (IV.3.a)

Rist, Ray C.
1973 The Urban School: A Factory for Failure. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press. (III.4; V.5.a; VI.3; VI.4)

1974a Busing White Children into Black Schools: A Study in Controversy. Integrated Education 12(4):13-18. (V.1.c)

1974b Race, Policy, and Schooling. Society 12(1):59-63. (II.4)

1976 School Integration and Minority Student Tokenism. Integrated Education 14(1):18-20. (VI.2)

n.d. Bibliography from manuscript of his forthcoming book on desegregation in a west coast city. (I.2)

Rist, Ray C., and Gary Orfield
1976 School Desegregation and White Flight, Introduction. Social Policy 6(4):6-8. (IV.1; V.2.c)

Rivlin, Alice M.
1973 Forensic Social Science. In Perspectives on Inequality. Harvard Educational Review 43(1):25-40. (III.4)

Rodgers, Frederick A., *et al.*
1973 Identification of Problems and Concerns Regarding Educational Research and Development Activities Involving Black Citizens. A Final Report. ERIC: ED091360.

Report on a Conference of black educators, professionals, and citizens held by the National Institute of Education for the purpose of gaining input for NIE's research and development efforts. Great emphasis was given by the conferees to greater control over policy formation research objectives and methodologies, and governance of the schools.

Rodgers, Harrell R., Jr., and Charles S. Bullock
1972 School Desegregation: A Policy Analysis. Journal of Black Studies 2(4):409-437. (III.3)

Rogers, David
1967 Obstacles to School Desegregation in New York City: A Benchmark Case. *In* Educating an Urban Population. Marilyn Gittell, Ed. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, Inc. pp. 155-184. (V.2.a)

Rogers takes a close look at New York City desegregation, defining roles of some of the important participants involved, including ethnic groups, parents, school board and certain school-related political organizations.

Roper, Susan Stavert
1971 The Effect of Race on Assertive Behavior and Responses to Assertive Behavior in Small Groups. EDIC: ED051317. (VI.3.c)

Rose, Arnold
1964 De Facto School Segregation. New York: National Conference of Christians and Jews. (IV.1)

Rosen, Bernard C.
1956 The Achievement Syndrome: A Psychocultural Dimension on Social Stratification. American Sociological Review 21(April): 203-211. (IV.3.a)

1959 Race, Ethnicity and the Achievement Syndrome. American Sociological Review 24:47-60 (VI.2.a)

Rosenberg, Morris, and Roberta G. Simons
1972 Black and White Self-Esteem: The Urban School Child. Washington, DC: American Sociological Association. (VI.2.b)

Rosenfeld, Gerry
1971 "Shut Those Thick Lips!" A Study of Slum School Failure. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston. (III.4; VI.3.d)

Rosenthal, Robert, and Lenore F. Jacobson
1968 Pygmalion in the Classroom. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston. (IV.3.c)

Sachdeva, Darshan
1973 A Measurement of Changes in Interracial Student Attitudes in Desegregated Schools. Journal of Educational Research 66(9):418-422. (VI.3.b)

St. John, Nancy H.
1971 Thirty-Six Teachers: Their Characteristics and Outcomes for Black and White Pupils. American Educational Research Journal 8(4):635-647. (VI.1.a)

1975 School Desegregation, Outcomes for Children. New York: John Wiley and Sons. (VI; VI.2.b; VI.2.c; VI.3; VI.3.a; VI.3.c)

Reviews over 120 published and unpublished articles describing research studies designed to investigate the consequences for children of school desegregation; she stresses the multifaceted nature of a social phenomenon such as desegregation which can, under differing conditions, have both positive and negative results; especially good for its appendices of charts which organize the research reviewed by problem studied, sample used, and findings.

St. John, Nancy H., and Ralph G. Lewis
1971 The Influence of School Racial Context on Academic Achievement. Social Problems 19:68-78. (VI.1.a)

1975 Race and the Social Structure of the Elementary Classroom. Sociology of Education 48:346-368. (VI.3.c)

Saint Louis Board of Education
1969 A Plan to Increase Vocational Education Opportunities Through the Expansion of Curriculum and Available Facilities. Final Report. ERIC: ED042881. (V.1.a)

Sartain, J. A.
1966 Attitudes of Parents and Children Towards Desegregation. Doctoral dissertation, Vanderbilt University. Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, 1967. No. 67-2836. (VI.3.b)

Schwartz, Robert, Thomas Pettigrew, and Marshall Smith
1968 Desegregation: Assessing the Alternatives. Nation's Schools 81(3): 61-66. (II.2; II.3)

Short policy-oriented discussion of alternatives to desegregation such as compensatory education and community control.

Scott, David W.
1972 School District Integration in a Metropolitan Area. Education and Urban Society 4(2):135-154. (V.1.d)

Seward, G.
1956 Psychotherapy and Culture Conflict. New York: Ronald Press. (VI.2.b)

Shaw, Marvin E.
1974 The Self-Image of Black and White Pupils in an Integrated School. Journal of Personality 42(1):12-22. (VI.2.b)

Shaycoft, Marion F.
1967 The High School Years: Growth in Cognitive Skills. Pittsburgh: American Institute for Research and School of Education, University of Pittsburgh. (VI.1.a)

Shuey, Audrey
1966 The Testing of Negro Intelligence. New York: Social Science Press. (IV.3.b)

Silberman, Charles E.
1962 The City and the Negro. Fortune 65(March):89-92.

Silverman, Irwin, and Marvin E. Shaw
1973 Effects of Sudden Mass School Desegregation on Interracial Interaction and Attitudes in one Southern City. Journal of Social Issues 29(4): 133-142. (VI.3.c)

Silverthorne, Colin, et al.
1974 The Effect of Competition and Cooperation on Level of Prejudice. Journal of Social Psychology 92:293-301. (VI.3.c)

Sizemore, Barbara
1972 Is There a Case for Separate Schools? Phi Delta Kappan 53(5): 281-284. (II.2; II.3; II.4)

Following Handlin, adopts definitions of integration and desegregation useful to understanding shift to Black Power orientation. Desegregation (racial balance) like segregation is seen as an imposition in which the superior/subordinate relationship is maintained. Sizemore incorporates into her essay notions of radical approaches to education such as Freire.

Smith, Marshall S., and J. S. Bissell
1970 Report Analysis: The Impact of Head Start. Harvard Educational Review 40:51-104. (V.5.c)

Smith, Paul M.
1971 The Role of the Guidance Counselor in the Desegregation Process. Journal of Negro Education 40(4):347-351. (V.5.e)

Smith, Ralph V., Stanley E. Flory, R. L. Bashshur, and G. W. Shannon
1967 Community Interaction and Racial Integration in the Detroit Area: an Ecological Analysis. Ypsilanti: Eastern Michigan University. (VI.2.a)

Sobel, Morton J.
1973 What's Really Blocking School Desegregation? Equal Opportunity Review (July):1-4. (V.4.b)

Somerville, Addison, W.
1969 The Neighborhood School Concept: Its Rationale and Practical Values. In Integration and Education. David W. Beggs and S. Kern Alexander, Eds. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company. pp. 121-142. (V.3)

Southern Regional Council
1969 The Federal Retreat in School Desegregation. Atlanta: Southern Regional Council. (III.3)

Southern Regional Council, and Robert F. Kennedy Memorial
1973 The Student Pushout: Victim of Continued Resistance to Desegregation. Atlanta: Southern Regional Council. (V.5.b)

Spady, W.
1973 The Impact of School Resources of Students. In Review of Research in Education. F. N. Kerlinger, Ed. Itasca, IL: F. E. Peacock. pp. 135-177. (V.4.b)

Spratlen, Thaddeus H.
1973 Financing Inner City Schools: Policy Aspects of Economics, Political and Racial Disparity. Journal of Negro Education 42(3): 283-307. (III.1.d)

Stanley, Julian C., Ed.
1973 Compensatory Education for Children Ages Two to Eight: Recent Studies of Educational Intervention. Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press. (V.5.c)

Stent, Madelon D., W. P. Hazard, and H. N. Rivlin
1973 Cultural Pluralism in Education: A Mandate for Change. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts. (V.5)

The book contains a set of papers given at a national conference on education and teacher education for cultural pluralism held in 1971. The conference was sponsored by a teacher training program funded by the Office of Education at the insistence of minority members of the program. The book also contains conference resolutions for action by OE based on the cultural pluralism approach.

Stout, Robert T., and Gerald E. Sroufe
1968 Politics Without Power, the Dilemma of a Local School System. Phi Delta Kappan 49(6):342-345. (V; V.4.a)

Suchman, Edward A., John P. Dean, and Robert M. Williams
1958 Desegregation: Some Propositions and Research Suggestions. New York: Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith. (V.1)

Sullivan, Neil V.
1968 Myths and Gaps in School Integration. Today's Education 57(6): 38-42. (II.1)

Supreme Court
1955 Text of the Supreme Court Opinions May 17, 1954. Social Problems 2(4):221-235. (IV.1.a)

Swanson, Bert E.
1965 School Integration Controversies in New York City, a Pilot Study. Bronxville, NY: Sarah Lawrence College, Institute for Community Studies. (V.1.b)

This report explores the problems and decision-making processes associated with introduction of desegregation in New York City, where the Princeton Plan of pairing was used.

Talbert, Carol
1970 Interaction and Adaptation in Two Negro Kindergartens. Human Organization 29(2):103-114. (VI.4)

Taylor, William
1973 The Legal Battle for Metropolitanism. School Review 81(3):331-345. (III.1.c)

Terjon, Kitty
1971 The Segregation Academy Movement. In The South and Her Children: School Desegregation 1970-1971. Southern Regional Council, Ed. Atlanta: Southern Regional Council. (V.2.b)

Thorndike Robert L.
1968 Review of Pygmalion in the Classroom. American Educational Research Journal 5(4):708-711. (IV.3.c)

University of Florida Libraries
1960 Segregation and Desegregation in American Education. Third Edition. Gainesville, FL: Education Library, College of Education, University of Florida. (I.2)

1962 Segregation and Desegregation in American Education. Fourth Edition. No. 62, May, 1962. Gainesville, FL: Education Library, College of Education, University of Florida. (I.2)

U. S. Commission on Civil Rights
1961 Third Annual Conference on Problems of Schools in Transition from the Educator's Viewpoint. Washington, DC: U. S. Government Printing Office. (V.1)

1967a Education Parks, Appraisals of Plans to Improve Educational Quality and Desegregate the Schools. U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, Clearing-House Publication No. 9. Washington, DC: U. S. Government Printing Office. (V.1)

1967b Racial Isolation in the Public Schools, Volumes 1 and 2. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office. (IV.1; V.1.b; VI.1.a)

1975 The Federal Civil Rights Enforcement Effort-1974. Volume 3: To Ensure Equal Educational Opportunity. Washington, DC: U. S. Government Printing Office. (III.1.f; III.2.b)

The fifth evaluation of the Federal Government's effort to end discrimination undertaken by the Commission covers the period between July 1972 and June 1974. The activities and responsibilities of a number of Federal agencies with civil rights enforcement responsibilities related to education are reviewed in this volume, including HEW's Office for Civil Rights; the Internal Revenue Service; and Veterans Administration.

Valentine, Charles A.
1971 Deficit, Difference and Bicultural Models of Afro-American Behavior. Harvard Educational Review 41(2):137-158. (II.4; IV.3.d)

1972 Models and Muddles Concerning Culture and Inequality. Harvard Educational Review 42(1):97-108. (IV.3.d)

A reply to some of the critics of Valentine's previous work on the relationship between culture and poverty and the nature of difficulties black people encounter in "mainstream" institutions. Valentine emphasizes the importance of structural inequalities.

Van Den Haag, Ernest
1960 Social Science Testimony in the Desegregation Cases - A Reply to Professor Kenneth Clark. Villanova Law Review 6:69-79. (III.4)

Vander Zanden, James W.
1958 Turbulence Accompanying School Desegregation. Journal of Educational Sociology 32(2):68-75. (V.2.a; V.4.a)

Veroff, Joseph, and Stanton Peele
1969 Initial Effects of Desegregation on the Achievement Motivation of Negro Elementary School Children. Journal of Social Issues 25(3):71-91. (VI.2.a)

Vontress, Clemmont E.
1969 Cultural Differences: Implications for Counseling. Journal of Negro Education 38(3):266-275. (V.5.e)

Walker, Dollie, et al.
1967 School Desegregation in Baltimore. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University. (IV.1)

Watson, Bernard C.
1975 School Integration: Its Meaning, Costs and Future, In From Brown to Bradley, School Desegregation 1954-1974. R. Stephen Browning, Ed. Cincinnati: Jefferson Law Book Company. pp. 15-17. (VI.1.b)

Weber, George, and Arthur Pearl
1966 Two Views Concerning Ability Grouping. Southern Education Report 2(5):2-8. (V.5.a)

Webster, S. W., and M. N. Kroger
1966 A Comparative Study of Selected Perceptions and Feelings of Negro Adolescents With and Without White Friends in Integrated Urban High Schools. Journal of Negro Education 35:55-61. (VI.3.c)

Weinberg, Meyer
1968 Desegregation Research: An Appraisal. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa. (VI)

Reviews and assesses experimental studies, most unpublished, of the many hypotheses related to school desegregation.

Weinberg, Meyer, Ed.
1967 School Integration: A Comprehensive Classified Bibliography of 3,100 References. Chicago: Integrated Education Association. (I.2)

1970 The Education of the Minority Child: A Comprehensive Bibliography of 10,000 Selected Entries. Chicago: Integrated Education Association. (I.2)

Weinstein, Eugene A., and Paul N. Geisel
1962 Family Decision Making Over Desegregation. Sociometry 25(1): 21-29. (V.1.a)

Westphal, Mary C.
1970 Reaction: Minority Sensitivity Training. Public Personnel Review 31(2):74-77. (V.5.e)

Wey, Herbert, and John Corey
1959 Action Patterns in School Desegregation, a Guidebook. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa. (V.1; VI.4)

White, R. D.
1974 School Finance Reform: Courts and Legislatures. Social Science Quarterly 55:331-346. (II.2)

Examines the Rodriguez case in the context of the interaction between the judicial and legislative elements.

White, Sheldon H., M. C. Day, R. K. Freeman, S. A. Hartman, and K. P. Messenger
1973 Federal Programs for Young Children: Review and Recommendations. Washington, DC: U. S. Government Printing Office. (V.5.c)

White William F.
1969 Psychological Principles Applied to Class Teachers. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company. (IV.3.c)

Wholey, Joseph S., John W. Scanlon, Hugh G. Duffy, James S. Fukumoto, and Leona M. Vogt
1970 Federal Evaluation Policy: Analyzing the Effects of Public Programs. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute. (III.4)

Williams, John E.
1966 Connotations of Racial Concepts and Color Names. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology: 331-340. (VI.2.b)

Williams, John E., Deborah L. Best, Frank B. Wood, and John W. Filler
1973 Changes in the Connotations of Racial Concepts and Color Names: 1963-1970. Psychological Reports 33(3):983-996. (VI.2.b)

Williams, Robert L., and F. Venditti
1969 Effect of Academic Integration of Southern Negro Students' Expressed Satisfaction with School. Journal of Social Psychology 79(2):203-209. (VI.2.a)

Willie, Charles V.
1964 Anti-Social Behavior Among Disadvantaged Youth: Some Observations on Prevention for Teachers. Journal of Negro Education 33(1): 176-181. (V.5.e)

Willover, Donald J., Terry L. Eidell, and Wayne K. Hoy
1973 Penn State Studies. No. 24. The School and Pupil Control Ideology. University Park: Pennsylvania State University. (V.5; VI.4)

Winschel, J. F.
1970 In the Dark . . . Reflections on Compensatory Education, 1960-1970. In Disadvantaged Child, Volume 3: Compensatory Education: A National Debate. J. Hellmuth, Ed. New York: Brunner/Mazel. pp. 3-23. (V.5.c)

Wisdom, John Minor
1975 Random Remarks on the Role of Social Sciences in the Judicial Decision-Making Process in School Desegregation Cases. Law and Contemporary Problems 39(1):134-150. (III.4)

Wolf, Eleanor P., and Leo Wolf
1962 Sociological Perspective on the Education of Culturally Deprived Children. The School Review 70(4):373-387. (IV.3.a)

Yarrow, Marion R., J. D. Campbell, and L. J. Yarrow
1958 Acquisition of New Norms: A Study of Racial Desegregation. Journal of Sociological Issues 14(8):8-28. (VI.2.b; VI.3)

Yudof, Mark G.
1975 Suspension and Expulsion of Black Students from the Public Schools: Academic Capital Punishment and the Constitution. Law and Contemporary Problems 39(2):374-411. (V.5.b)